BL 2727
.C6
Copy 1

A Critical Criticiser Criticised

OR

INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL ANALYZED.

BY

PAGE A. COCHRAN,

His Own Arguments Prove the very Things He Tries to Argue Against.

THE MS. FOR THIS WORK WAS BEING TYPEWRITTEN AT THE TIME OF MR. INGERSOLL'S DEATH. HIS LECTURE "WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED?" IS PRINTED IN THE BACK PART OF THIS BOOK.

Price, 50 Cents.

A CRITICAL CRITICISER CRITICISED

OR

INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL ANALYZED.

BY

PAGE A. COCHRAN,

His Own Arguments Prove the very Things He Tries to Argue Aaginst. The Ms. for this Work was being Typewritten at the Time of Ingersoll's Death.

INGERSOLL'S LECTURE, "WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED," IS PRINTED IN THE BACK PART OF THIS BOOK.

ST. ALBANS, VT.
1900.

BL 2727
.C6

35059

Library of Congress
TWO COPIES RECEIVED
AUG 16 1900
Copyright entry
Aug. 22, 1899
No. 53650
SECOND COPY.
Delivered to
ORDER DIVISION,
SEP 21 1900

80062

Entered according to act of Congress in the year 1899,
BY PAGE A. COCHRAN,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Re-cat. C. R. 7 Ag. '39

CHAPTER SUBJECTS.

I.

FAITH OR BELIEVING.

Serpent.—Atonement.—Faith, or Believing.—Regeneration.—Race Extinct without Faith.—Sowing.—Rich Ruler.—Interpolation.

II.

FAITH OR BELIEVING.

Interpolation.—Love Giver more than Gift.—Catholic Slaughterings, Object of.—Sermon on the Mount.—Predestination.—Zaccheus.—Crucifiction of Thieves.

III.

BELIEVING WITHOUT UNDERSTANDING.

Ingersoll Uses Arguments that Prove the Things he Tries to Argue Against.—Inspiration.—Discovery of Truth.

IV.

FINAL BLOW TO INGERSOLL'S NO-FAITH GOSPEL.

The object of this Chapter, (Ingersoll denying the necessity of believing anything to be saved) is to show that he proves his own doctrine false, and that to be saved by his gospel, faith is an absolute necessity as much as though we accept the Bible gospel.—Ingersoll's ways of Being Saved.

V.

CHRISTIANITY–BARBARISM.

Fall of Nations, Cause of.—This Republic will soon go.

VI.

FRANCE.

Infidelity's Heinous Work.—Dissolute Girl to Take the Place of Deity.—Infidelity of France Causing Fulfilment of Prophecy, Etc., Etc.

VII.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLIGENCE.

Crime a Mistake.—Every Good Thing in His Gospel Taken from Gospel of Christ.—Difference in worldly and True wisdom.—Ingersoll Shows same Hypocrisy Towards and Crucifies the same Christ as Hypocrites of Old.

VIII.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLIGENCE CONTINUED.

Blasphemy.—Dungeon of Mind.—Traitors.—Liberty.—"Men Loved Darkness."

IX.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLIGENCE CONTINUED.

Read Testament.—Admits Need of Forgiveness Number of Times; Denies it as Many.—Can we Be Unjust to God?—He says "No Bankrupt Court in Next world, Every Cent Must Be Paid."—The Injured Girl.—Never Happy as Though we Had Not Sinned?—His Gospel incomplete.

X.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLIGENCE CONCLUDED.

Heaven or Hell Our Own Choice.—He Despises Humility and the Atonement of Christ.—"Every Cent Must Be Paid;" but no way to Pay It.—Heaven where Those Are we Love.—Some Saved; Others Lost.

XI.

REVISED VERSION OF INGERSOLL'S CHAPTER ON "THE METHODISTS."

Great Opinion of Self.—His Calling.—Unlike Wesley.—Rescuing the Deity.—Infidels Their Own Enemies.

XII.

SLIGHT ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF HUMOR.

Wine, Tobacco, Hay.—A Mistake That Solemn People Are Always Stupid and That no Humorous Person Ever Founded a Religion.—Humor no Tendency to Make People what They Should Be.—Despondency of Great Humorists.—Something Lacking in Soul Regardless of Humor.—God's Mistakes.—Enemies.—Ingersoll Divided Against Himself.—Unconsciously Reveals Belief in Prophets.

XIII.

INGERSOLL PUZZLED—MYSTERY EXPLAINED.

Christ Did Not write a word, Nor Command Others to write or Preserve His Sayings, or Sign the writings himself; Christ Could Not Have Done a Sillier Thing, for He Is that Word.—No Command to Preserve word; but Divine Information that in would be Preserved.—Ingersoll's Reason for Christ's writing Nothing; Reply Thereto.

XIV.

INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF SCIENCE

Also Goes Against Him, for by it we May Explain, from Common-Sense Principles, Miracles and Inspiration.

XV.

MISCELLANEOUS GLEANINGS.

Calvin.—Voltaire.—Methodist Converts.—Flood.—Babel Tower.—Science.—Good Times Coming.

XVI.

IN CONCLUSION.

XVII.

SINCE INGERSOLL DIED.

PREFACE.

The manuscript for this work was being type-written at the time of Mr. Ingersoll's death and as his works are still published and sold, and as "A Eulogy to Ingersoll"—in book form—has been published since his death it is evident that this book appears upon the scene at the right time. It should be read by Spiritualists and all who read the "Free Thought Magazine" or any of that class of literature.

Some will object to the publication of this book because Ingersoll is not here. Some will say, "Let the dead rest." Some will say, "What does he expect to gain by printing that now—writing about a dead man?" Others will say something different. And the writer is aware that such things should be looked for. He knows that some, of influence too, will thus endeavor to hurl their icy bomb-shells and lethean doses of anæsthetic powders into the arena, the tendency of which would be to dampen and chill and paralyze the ardor of many who will read and digest. But they forget that most of the people who thus criticise this work have been and are to-day, above all classes of people in the world, anxiously reaching out after books and writings from the pen of such men as Mr. Ingersoll who talked and wrote about dead men all his life time, and who was in his greatest glory when, with his "bright wit" and "catchy rhetoric," so-called, he was ridiculing and abusing the memories of the greatest and best and most useful men that ever lived, like

Moses and the Prophets; and Wesley and Calvin and Luther. *And we long ago came to the conclusion that he who would meet with success must be willing to face opposition, and deliberately, calmly and quietly, move along in defiance of opposing forces.*

While at the head of each chapter I have mentioned subjects treated, one must read the chapter if he wishes to get any idea of the manner in which they are treated and thereby get the force of the arguments. As a rule you can go ahead of a speaker, in your thoughts, when he gets to certain points, and form an idea of how his thought will terminate; but you will find it impossible to do so in this case.

Mr. Ingersoll aims to overthrow the principles of Christianity as taught in the Bible—miracles, inspiration, the divinity of Christ, the atonement, salvation by faith, regeneration or the new birth and tries to show that Matthew, Mark and Luke did not preach the new birth or atonement or necessity of believing. *The aims of the author of this book are to clearly reveal the incorrectness of Ingersoll's argument and to show that his own arguments prove the things that he argues against.*

Friends of good judgment advise me that perhaps I am too personal, so much so that the strong statements and personalities would be detrimental to the sale of the book; but let the reader ever keep before him the fact that the writer has a keen perception and appreciation of the "vasty" difference between flippant nonsense and personal abuse, and good logical and irresistable argument, that he aims to indulge in the latter even more than in humorous strikes, and intends no personal abuse, and never indulged in anything but kindly feeling for Mr. Ingersoll and I believe he can take no exceptions to my plain way of putting things and will see that I simply meet him, in brotherly kindness, on his own battle-field and fight him with the material for which he calls, common-sense, intelligence, science. But the weapons with which he attacks Christianity are keen reproach, ironical and misleading wit, and ridicule.

This is a reply, more particularly to his lecture "What Must We Do to be Saved," and statements made in the N. Y. Journal, Feb. 19, 1897. *The above named lecture is printed in the back part of this book and should be read before beginning our reply.*

PAGE A. COCHRAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

CHAPTER I.

FAITH OR BELIEVING.

Serpent.—Atonement.—Faith, or Believing.—Regeneration.—Race Extinct without Faith.—Sowing.—Rich Ruler.—Interpolation.

(Please read the preface; and should the reader think me too personal in speaking of the dead let him remember that when this was written we were speaking to and of the living.)

I have in my possession, at the time of this writing, a copy of Ingersoll's lecture: "What Must We Do to be Saved." The very outside page of the cover of that book shows the condition that an infidel realizes his soul to be in. Yea! how unconsciously and unwittingly has he there portrayed the condition of the sinner without redemption! Behold the serpent coiled around the stalk with his head couched behind it, with his hissing detestable mouth wide open ready to strike his poisonous fangs into the flesh of the passerby! Behold the virus! but where is the antidote? Behold the disease! but where is the remedy?

In the preface of that book Ingersoll says that nothing is said by Matthew, Mark, or Luke about the atonement. A principal argument running through the lecture seems to be that those three Apostles neither knew or said anything of the atonement, or the need of faith. What

are the facts? He either wilfully deceives the ignorant or he uses little reason himself. What person with a thimble full of sense inside of his skull will say to any rational being that any man ever preached Christ without preaching the atonement? Christ is the atonement. In preaching Christ, did they not, therefore, preach the atonement? Who then was more earnest in preaching the atonement than the very men, Matthew, Mark and Luke whom Ingersoll says never preached it? They are also noted for quoting from the Prophets when coming to a place of fulfilled prophecy. The Prophets proclaimed the atoning Christ and that was the object of Matthew, Mark and Luke in quoting them.

Now about believing, or faith: Christ said in the sermon on the Mount, Recorded in Matt., that only those who do the will of His Father can enter His kingdom. What is the Father's will? That ye believe on Him whom He (the Father) hath sent. Does not that concern our faith? Nobody ever did God's will, kept the commandments, without believing. We cannot do the will of the Father without doing the will of the Son. We cannot do the gospel of Christ without doing the will of the Father. The will of the Father and the Son toward us are identical. It is among the impossibilities for any rational being to live up, to the best of their ability, to the righteous standard of the Bible gospel and remain an unbeliever.

I want you to remember also that in the Christ of the New Testament is the God of the Old. When some unbelieving Jews were trying to pick flaws in Christ he said to them, "Before Abraham was I Am." Do you catch the meaning? When Moses was commanded to go and lead the Israelites from Egypt, God said, tell them "I Am has sent you." So when the Jews asked Christ if He was

greater than their Father Abraham He represented Himself as the same great "I Am" who was the God of their forefathers. These things being facts, when Christ said in Matthew, do my Father's will or miss of heaven, it was equivalent to saying what Ingersoll says the first three gospels do not mention, a need of faith for salvation; because none would do the Father's will without faith. Where are your senses? And that is the intelligence that Ingersoll says must save the world.

In the Old Testament God says, "Look unto me and be ye saved." The same God, in Christ, said in Luke, come to me for rest. In one place we are told to "look," in the other to "come." Both are equivalent to declaring salvation through faith, for certainly if we did not believe we would not come, we would not look.

We are told also, in Matthew, that when the Pharisees and Sadusees came to John the Baptist to be baptised in the name of Christ, he said to them, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" Another recognition, in Matthew, of salvation through faith, for they would not have acted without believing.

Positive evidence of the necessity of faith in the atonement, for salvation, is found also in the 21st chapter of Matthew. Christ asked the chief priests and elders from whence John's baptism was. They, knowing enough to know that Christ, as ever, had the better of them reasoned this way: "If we say, of men, he will say, we fear the people; if we say from heaven, he will say, why did you not believe him?" They believed not, but preferred still to remain in their sins. Christ also told them that the publicans and harlots would go into the kingdom of God before them, and the very next verse tells us that it is because they accept salvation by a living faith. "For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed

him not: but the publicans and harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen repented not afterward, that ye might believe him." Mark tells us the same thing. What can be plainer than these things proving the falsity of Ingersoll's statements?

In closing his chapter on St. John he says the ideas of salvation depending upon belief, and the necessity of regeneration find their warrant "in the book of John" and "nowhere else."

We need to say but little on the gospels, about the atonement, or salvation by faith; and a perfectly direct statement is made in regard to conversion in the gospel by Matt., 18:3. The gospel, according to Matthew, Mark and Luke, as well as John and all the epistles, are full of regeneration. The coming to love God and allowing his righteousness to sway us is regeneration. Are not Matthew, Mark and Luke, and the Pentateuch and all the Prophets full of it?

Record is given in Matthew, Mark and Luke of Christ having said to a lady, "Thy faith hath made thee whole," and one of them adds, "Go in peace." In Luke he said to a man, "Thy faith hath made thee whole." Christ said of the woman with the box of ointment, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much." Some murmered at that. Then "He said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee." There you see is a direct statement in Luke, from Christ's own lips of the necessity of a faith in him. Read it in Luke 7:36-50. In Luke 18:42 he said to a blind man, "Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee." And he glorified God. "And all the people, when they saw it, gave praise unto God." How? Through their faith, of course. The Apostles were prayed for by the Savior, that their faith fail not.

Luke wrote the book of Acts, and you read Acts 13:45-48. The Jews disbelieved the gospel you see and so remained in their sins. The Jews being the chosen people of the Lord it was necessary to first give the gospel to them; but they, as it was said to them, judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life, and lo, they "turned to the Gentiles." When the Gentiles heard that redemption was for them also "they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." Notice now, eternal life came to the Gentiles by faith in Christ. See? They believed. All who believed were ordained to eternal life. No case is given in the Bible of an unbeliever ever being ordained to eternal life. In rehearsing what God had done, it was there told "how he had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles."

In Matthew 9:2, a palsied man was taken to the Savior, and Jesus seeing their faith said, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." In Luke, 24:25, Christ reproved unbelief thus, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken." Matthew, Mark and Luke all tell us of Christ having said, "O faithless and perverse generation! how long shall I suffer you?" And all this, understand, to prove the falsity of Ingersoll's statement regarding regeneration and salvation by faith. And yet Ingersoll calls himself an honest man; but if he is honest he has showed himself devoid of common sense in this matter. "From the temple of morality and truth, the parasitic and poisonous vines of faith must be be torn?"

Faith is a necessary element in temporal life. Eradicate that element from our scientists' lives and what would become of the science, which Ingersoll says in a

later writing, can be the only possible Savior of this world? Eradicate that element from the human mind and the science of Geology would no longer unearth the mysteries of our own planet; the mighty heavens, in their sublimity, would no longer be penetrated by the anxiously searching eye of the astronomer; without it Cyrus W. Field would not have labored year after year for the construction of the Atlantic cable, against mountainous obstacles and the buffetting of all the world. Samuel Morse's preconceived idea of telegraphy the world held in contempt, considering it as only a whimsical vision of a fanatic. Had not the world moved on to a faith in telegraphy it never would have been used. The same may be said of all useful inventions and discoveries. Had that mighty element been expunged from the life of Samuel Morse he never would have constructed that apparatus whose little click grasps the thoughts of man, as they are poured off the finger tips of the operator, and made to traverse land and sea with speed of the lightning's flash!

Speaking from a temporal standpoint: exterminate all faith from the mind of man, and you rob him of his health, you rob him of his mind, you rob him of all hope and you rob him of his life! Deprive humanity of faith and in less than three seconds every heart will cease to beat, every breast will have heaved its last sigh. In less than three seconds every countenance will drop, the last agonizing groan will be forced into expression by an unutterable despair, and the human race will be extinct.

Look again, dear reader, at Ingersoll's statement, "Matthew, Mark and Luke say nothing about the atonement and the scheme of salvation by faith; in the book of John all these doctrines find their warrant; nowhere else." Has it not become evident by this time that his object in searching the scriptures is not to get at the truth

of what they say? Let us look a little further: John the Baptist was the forerunner of Christ. The Prophets foretold it: Christ recognized him as such, "And John," according to all three, Matthew, Mark and Luke, "did baptise, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Did they not confess and repent through faith? Is not real repentance conversion? And John "Preached, saying, there cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed baptise you with water; but he shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost." Can you find a scriptural testimony that anybody ever was or can be baptised with the Holy Spirit while remaining in unbelief? Is not that regeneration?

After John was in prison Christ began to preach, saying, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." What for? To secure their salvation of course.

There is a passage in Mark, on this subject, stated so plainly that even Ingersoll could not mistake its meaning, and so he calls it an interpolation. It is this: "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Whatever is found in proof of the atonement, against unbelief, and in favor of the miraculous, Ingersoll pretends to believe are interpolations. Robert can crawl through a very small hole if he is a large man.

See now what Christ says in Luke 8:11-12, while explaining the parable of the sower: "The seed is the word of God. Those by the wayside, are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." Notice now how saving faith comes in there: "Lest they should believe and be saved."

Ingersoll quotes Christ's interview with the rich young ruler as proof against a need of faith. Among other things he says that Christ "did not say to him, 'You must remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.'" What were the first words of the Savior to him? "Keep the commandments." Read them and see whether Christ told him to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." He also says, "he did not say, 'You must believe in me—you must be born again—you must believe the Bible.'" Why should he? The act of coming to Christ as he did and addressing him as he did was a perfect acknowledgment that those things were needful. His testimony was, "I have kept these commandments." Christ saw the one thing that stood between him and his Creator; and the young man very well knew that that was where the trouble lay, for "he went away feeling sorrowful" and rejected Christ for what there is without him. It is the last we hear of that rich gentleman. Now there are thousands who testify that as soon as they gave up their pet sin, or worldly idol, they immediately received the conscious evidence of sins forgiven.

Here is a fact worth noticing: Christ never said to an unbeliever, "Thy faith hath saved thee; thy faith hath made thee whole; thy sins are forgiven thee" nor anything to that effect.

CHAPTER II.

FAITH OR BELIEVING.

Interpolation.—Love Giver More than Gift.—Catholic Slaughterings, Object of.— Sermon on Mount.— Predestination.— Zaccheus.— Crucifixion of Thieves.

Next Mr. Ingersoll quotes another verse and says he believes it to be an interpolation : "And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife. or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." Then he comments thus : "Why, he said to this man that asked him, 'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' Among other things, he said: 'Honor thy father, and thy mother.' And we turn over the page and he says again, 'If you will desert your father and mother you shall have everlasting life.' 'It will not do.'" No honest man using his senses, can say, "Honor them;" and then say, "Dishonor them." Christ saw James and John, with Zebedee their father and called them to follow him. They left their father to follow Christ; but that is not saying that they deserted him, by way of contempt and abuse;

nor there is not such a thing advised even in this passage that Mr Ingersoll calls an interpolation. Robert Ingersoll very well knows that many, for having turned from a life of all sorts of wickedness; have been obliged to leave home and friends or return to their profligacy, and deny even the good that he himself preaches.

Many have been turned from the house of their friends and wilfully despised and deserted, because of their righteous life, but rather than give up the good way that has brought to them the sweetness of God's love and redeeming grace they have gone from home and friends to be disowned and despised by the ones they loved. Yet they would not leave in envy and spite; but in kindness and love, earnestly praying and working for the good of their persecutors. Who will say that they have not done right and accomplished much more good than they could otherwise have done; and that it did not take much more courage, and a far greater love so to do? Is there not a vast difference in spiteful desertion and a necessary leaving?

Here is a newly married couple. They step out by themselves, forsaking home and all the friends. Do they do wrong? Is it not right that he should think more of his wife than of father, mother, brothers or sisters? Is it not right that she should think more of her husband than of father, mother, brothers or sisters? Before leaving do they not plant the kiss of endearing friendship upon the lips of the loved ones at home? Yet they do not improperly forsake the same with all its attractions. Whatever foolish things they may have said in the past about getting away from home are generally corrected then. Then it is that they begin to form a realization of what it is to have a home supplied by father and mother, where all may live and love together. Their love and interest, then, for their friends is not lessened, by loving another supremely, but in-

creased. And the same must be said with reference to the passages that Ingersoll has tried to make out as contradictory.

He says, "I will never desert the one I love for the promise of any God." Little does he know just what he might do if he were to let the beautiful love of the redeeming Lord into his soul, and then have the one he loves turn him a cold shoulder, and despise and reject him, because he would not worship Roman images, pray to the Virgin Mary and the so-called Roman Saints; confess his sins to the Roman Priest, proclaim the supremacy of the Pope, and acknowledge the priesthood on a par with God. Little does he know what he might do if he were filled with a wonderous love he never knew before and then be despised and rejected by the one he loved because he would not permit his daughters to become entangled and soaked in the animal passions of Roman Priests; or to use his own words, "To take the veil and renounce the joys and beauties of this life, and allowing these spider-like Priests to weave webs to catch the loving maidens of the world."

He also says, "It is far more important to love your wife than to love God." That is like saying that it is more important for the children to love the things supplied, by father and mother, for their amusement and comfort than to love father and mother. The more we love a person the more will we love a gift from that person, and if Mr. Ingersoll knew what it was to love God he would know a thousand times sweeter love for his God-given helpmeet. I wonder what he would think to know that his family, which he loves and provides for, cared nothing for him, but all they cared for was what the contents of his pocket-book supplied?

From what source does he receive the ability of loving and enjoying wife and friends? He might say that that ability is implanted in him by nature. What is nature?

Did not a good God implant that ability within him? Where did he get a good wife to help make a man of him, and to become a powerful factor in making him feel that he has something to live for? Is not she, who is heaven's best earthly gift to man, supplied him by a good God, by the creative genius of the Almighty?

He further adds, "The holiest altar in all the world is the fireside around which gather father and mother and the sweet babes." Good! as far as it goes; but his words all amount to this: revel in the gift but forget the giver! That is all wrong. It is important, and it is for our good here, that we love God, the giver of every good gift, far above what we love the gift, and if Ingersoll would only learn to do that he would find himself enjoying a love for these good gifts a thousand times grander and sweeter than he ever knew before, or than it is possible to know in any other way.

Many a person when they would not admit the love of God into their hearts, have been carried, beyond their control, into degredation and debauchery, leaving family in loathsome dens with empty closets, and empty flour barrels, and empty sheds, while they revel in drunken debauchery and ludeness, and often in robbery and murder; but whenever such persons have opened their hearts to receive the Savior's love, they have been regenerated, and lifted from degeneracy and brutality to manhood and truth; and wretched homes of want and despair have been turned to homes of happiness and plenty. How? Through faith.

When Mr. Ingersoll makes all these statements, together with the following, "It is far more important that you love your children than that you love Jesus Christ," he is not honestly presenting this matter. The truth is this: parents cannot really love the Lord Jesus Christ

without loving their children far better than they possibly could if they did not love Christ. The more we love God the better we love our friends and fellow-men, and by loving him there is a sanctity and purity and sweetening influence in our life that could not otherwise be there.

Another statement of his: "This frightful declaration, 'He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned,' has filled the world with agony and crime. Every letter of this passage has been sword and fagot; every word has been dungeon and chain. That passage made the sword of persecution drip with innocent blood through centuries of agony and crime. That passage made the horizon of a thousand years lurid with the fagot's flames;" (this he says referring to Catholic slaughterings) thus: "thousands of volumes could not contain the crimes of the Catholic church. They could not contain even the names of her victims. With sword and fire, with rack and chain, with dungeon and whip she endeavored to convert the world." Do you see his idea? He would have us understand that the Catholic church took that way to convert the world to Christ; but such is not the case. Such crimes were not resorted to for the purpose of converting the world to Christianity; but as a means whereby they hoped to compel the world, to come like working oxen, under the Roman yoke that they might—convert the world to Christ and make good men and women of them? No; but that the world might be converted to the slavery and servitude of cruel politicians, whose right name is despot; and a beastly hypocritical organization, that called itself a church, whose right name is "Whited Sepulchre." Then you see it is not that passage, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," that has caused the agony and crime of which

he speaks. That passage never led people to commit crime; but it has saved many from it. It is not that passage that has caused the Catholic church to use "sword and fire, rack and chain, dungeon and whip to convert the world;" it was the despotic ambition of corrupt and oppressing politicians coupled with the influence of a church governor whose hypocrisy knew no bounds—whom the prophecies call a beast—that used those means, not to convert the world to Christianity; but to convert the world to their own greedy selves. Ingersoll himself virtually acknowledges this, thus tearing to pieces his own infamous declaration regarding "that passage." Read what he says and see if you do not agree with me: "That church went in partnership with the tyrants of the throne, and between these two vultures, the altar and the throne, the heart of man was devoured."

Ingersoll undertakes to show by his lecture that it is Christianity that causes crime; but nothing could be more absurd, it is the lack of Christianity, whether it be committed by an infidel or a church member. It is not as he talks, faith in Christ or Christianity, that lures men to cruel exercise of power, or that causes trouble of soul, or distress of mind; but a lack of faith, a lack of Christianity. He also says of that passage, "it contradicts the sermon on the mount." Just read Christ's sermon on the mount and see for yourself. Notice particularly from the 21st verse of the last chapter of the sermon: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name; and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? "And then shall I confess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me ye that work iniquity.

"Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. "And the rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock." Who will presume to say that people will do these things if they do not believe? And Christ said it was necessary to do them.

But read now what becomes of the unbeliever: "Every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: "And the rains descended, and the floods came, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it." Why? It was founded upon the sand. They believed not on Christ. A life founded upon riches, honors, pleasures, immorality, and dishonesty; and things outside the gospel of Christ, is on sinking sand.

Ingersoll says, "No man can control his belief." I repeat a former statement: "No man can try to live by the Bible and be an unbeliever. Men may educate themselves to infidelity; and yet something will tell them "You are going wrong, you are making your bed in hell." He says, "You cannot believe as you wish. You must believe as you must." This is not wholly true: people cannot wish to believe in the Bible and be unbelievers. But see! "You cannot believe as you wish, you must believe as you must.' What! predestination? You see he comes around with what he calls intelligence and unconsciously preaches predestination, a doctrine he so vehemently denies, in other places, that it seems as though he could not think of words of condemnation strong enough.

Then he calls up Christ's interview with Zaccheus as evidence against the idea of salvation by faith in Bible doctrines. He quotes the following: "And Zaccheus stood and said unto the Lord, "Behold, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I will restore him fourfold?" "And Jesus said unto him, 'This day is salvation come to thy house?" He of course admits that "that is good doctrine," and says, "He did not ask Zaccheus what he believed, he did not ask him, 'Do you believe in the Bible?'" or "Have you ever been baptised?'" And that is Ingersoll's reasoning. Why should he have asked such questions! When a couple present themselves to the minister to be married what sense would there be in asking them, "Do you believe in getting married?" John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, had for some time been baptising people all through those parts, publicans included—Zaccheus was a publican—and his acceptance of Christ was evidence of his having been baptised or of his readiness to be, and also of his belief in the Bible. How is it now? When people really accept of Christ are they not ready to be baptised? So it was then. And do they not believe in the Bible now? So they did then. Why ask a man with a lighted cigar in his mouth, do you smoke?

The last sins we are ready to let go of are our idols, our pet sins. Zaccheus was a publican, a tax collector, who collected much more tax than the law called for, and used the surplus to line his own pockets. He was such a lover of money that he was going to have it no matter how he got it. Now can any sane and honest man say that Zaccheus complied with the requirements of Christ and the Bible without believing in them? Allow me to repeat: Jesus Christ never said to an unbeliever, "Salva-

tion has come to thy house, thy faith hath saved thee, thy faith hath made thee whole, thy sins are forgiven thee," or anything to that effect.

Ingersoll, speaking of the crucifixion of Christ and the two thieves, says: "In Luke we are told that one railed on him, but one of the thieves looked and pitied Christ, and Christ said to that thief, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'" "Why did he say that?" he asks, and answers "Because the thief pitied him." Luke does not say that this thief "looked and pitied Christ:"

Then he asks some questions about this thief and answers them to fit his argument, not in accordance with honesty. "Who was this thief? To what church did he belong? I do not know" he answers, and adds, "The fact that he was a thief, throws no light on that question." This latter statement is a misrepresentation of the scriptures. When people mentioned in the Bible, who were called the children of God, indulged in sin, the Bible was honest, free to divulge the bad as well as the good, and never tried to hide the wrong as Ingersoll here tries to make out, and this fact is powerful evidence in favor of the scriptures. He further asks, "What did he believe?" and answers, "I do not know." "Did he believe in the Old Testament? In the miracles?" and replies, "I do not know." "Did he believe that Christ was God?" and declares, "I do not know." If we can show that he believed that Christ was God then we have positive evidence that he believed in the miracles and in the Old Testament, and have answered affirmatively, these questions concerning his belief. If that thief had not believed in those things, he would not have called Christ "Lord" and begged just in his dying moments, to be remembered in his kingdom, when he had been an enemy to the teachings of Christ all his life. But that was not all, that thief

went so far as to plainly and stoutly declare that Christ was God. Read it for yourself in Luke 23:40-42, "But the other answering, rebuked him, saying dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?" —Christ was then nailed to the Cross—"And we indeed justly, for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he said unto Jesus 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.'" And yet Mr. Ingergoll says he don't know what this thief believed, whether he believed that Christ was God or not. What intelligence that is! But this being only a specimen of the way he read and treated the New Testament at the time he made up his mind to read it to find out what he must do to be saved, it cannot be wondered at that he did not get saved.

Now notice, he asks, "Why then was the promise made to that thief that he should meet Christ in paradise?" and his answer is, "Simply because he pitied suffering innocence upon the cross." Not so! It was because he followed the light of reason and of conscience, and believed and repented.

CHAPTER III.

BELIEVING WITHOUT UNDERSTANDING.

Ingersoll Uses Arguments that Prove the Things He Tries to Argue Against.—Inspiration.—Discovery of Truth.

Ingersoll has a good deal of fault to find because we believe what is beyond our power to comprehend. "Believing something" he says, "that you do not understand: Of course God cannot afford to reward a man for believing anything that is reasonable. God rewards only for believing something that is unreasonable. If you believe something that is improbable and unreasonable, you are a Christian, but if you believe something that you know is not so, then—you are a saint." He says, "In a little while the few more intelligent will be driven out of the church, and it will be governed by those who believe without understanding." There are many "improbable and unreasonable" things which he claims to believe, things which he knows are not so; but pretends to believe, like the loving wife and children, working in heaven in cold, hunger, poverty and dirt (a good account of this will be found in chapter 10) over their drunken besotted

father and husband, heaven being, as he says, "Where those are we love, and those who love us." So if we are only with those we love, with one arm going through a threshing machine we are in heaven; he knows it is not so but he believes it, so of course he is a saint. If you are only with those you love, and those who love you, you may be suffering with every joint puffed up with inflammatory rheumatism so that the jar made by a careless walking across the floor, strikes a dozen daggers through you, you are in heaven bear in mind: he knows it is not so but of course he wants to be a saint so he believes it. You know "God rewards only for believing something that is unreasonable" or "that you know is not so."

"Believing something that you do not understand?" I wonder how much he understands of what he believes. We live, we move, we have our being. Let wise Bob. Ingersoll tell us how. Let him reveal the secret, the power and the principle, to scientists that have been vaguely, but earnestly searching for it from time immemorial, and for his information his name will be immortalized. The grass grows: let this man who believes only what he understands kindly speak and tell us how. The vegetables and fruits grow to maturity, we partake of them for food, they are converted into blood, and from thence into flesh, bone, gristle, nerve, etc., etc.: let this wise man of the nineteenth century, who believes only what he understands, speak and tells us how.

The fact is he has been cuffed about from one roost to another until he is just done up. He has never got on to any perch yet but has let him down coflunk. He is just like the devil; cuff him off from one hobby horse and if he can't sneak around the other side and jump back onto the same one he will hop right on to another. He is worse than the devil, for he does not think of denying the divine

authority of the Bible. I fail to find words to express myself when I think of this man who calls himself a moral, intelligent and logical reasoner, bringing himself so low in the scale of morality, intelligence and decency, as to impose upon rational beings with such a satanic, idiotic, impudent requisition as that we believe only what we can understand. Dear reader, I am not jesting. I speak with solemnity and with reverence. I pity the man who is so beastly stubborn as not to give way to reason and to conscience when he is so driven to the wall that he can find no better argument than telling us to believe only what we can understand, which, in reality is no argument. As true as I pen these words, I never was filled with so powerful a faith in God and the Bible as while subjecting these sayings of Ingersoll's to a critical analysis. Convince me that the Bible is false and I will renounce it at once; but everything goes to show that it is true.

Be honest with yourself dear reader. Look the ground over intelligently and conscientiously and see if it would not require much more faith to believe these things that Ingersoll says than it does to believe the Bible. When he pretends to think that he believes only what he understands, it is himself, not the church, who believes what he knows is not so.

If we did not believe in only what we understand, we would believe in neither pain nor sorrow; anger nor calmness; joy nor bereavement; the sweetness of love nor the bitterness of hatred; in life nor in death. We would not believe in our own existence. Let the world set about the task of understanding many things that we are obliged to believe and in less than one week every human being on earth would be a maniac or a fool.

In the New York Journal of February 19, 1897, I noticed about two common columns of what agnosticism

seems well pleased to call common-sense. He says there that "The Dr. Halls, Talmages and Moodys; Bishop Doanes and Corrigans all love the absurd and glory in believing the impossible." We have already seen that "believing the impossible" and loving the greatest absurdities all rest upon himself unless he does not believe what he says he does; but we will see more of it yet.

In that paper he said, "Use your senses. Ministers, preachers, open your eyes, read your New Testament and think when you read. In a few years," he declared, "the intelligent will deny the inspiration of the Bible."

We have seen how Mr. Ingersoll has used his senses—or rather his nonsenses—when reading the Testament. We have seen how he opens his eyes, not to conscience, justice, and reason; but to injustice and foolishness, and we will see it more yet. Put one drop of stagnant water under a powerful microscope, and what a sight will you behold! And so when we put Ingersoll's sayings under the microscope of common-sense we find them literally teeming with obnoxious contradictions, dominated by the hydra-headed monsters of infidelity, dishonest arguments and inconsistencies.

A strong argument against Ingersollism is found in the fact that he works around and unconsciously and unwittingly produces arguments that prop up the very things which he aims to overthrow. He wants us to believe only what we understand and to "deny the inspiration of the Bible." Now, if Robert Ingersoll understands all he believes, he is inspired above anything that was ever claimed for any Bible character. He quotes the promise that if we forgive our fellow-men God will forgive us, and says, "I accept the condition. There" he says, "is an offer," and responds, "I accept it." And then he repeats, "If you will forgive men that trespass against you, God

will forgive your trespasses against him. "There" he says, "is a contract, a square promise," and answers, "I accept the terms." Where did this grand and infinite offer and promise come from? It came from God, for the promise is, God will forgive us. How did we get it? Through Jesus Christ who gave himself for us. So when Ingersoll accepts that offer he is acknowledging and accepting, and propping up, the very doctrines he aims to overthrow—the Bible as an inspired word; and yet in that Journal he says to ministers, "Use your senses," and "throw away all the ravings of the inspired;" but in the lecture, on page 78, he has very prominently brought out inspiration in his argument. Here is what he says: "Here is a woman whose husband has been lost at sea; the news comes that he has been drowned by the ever-hungry waves; but she waits. There is something in her heart that tells her he is alive, and she waits." Do you see the proof of inspiration? With perfect confidence she waits; because—she receives a telegram or reads in the paper that he was rescued? No. Because—somebody tells her? No, for telegraphic news is often wrong, and newspapers often make mistakes and town-talk is so uncertain; but in spite of all wrangling reports that may be in the wind she knows for herself and in a way that she does not guess at it nor take anybody's word for it, and she defies all contrary reports; but how and why? Because "there is something in her heart that tells her." And the inspiration proves correct for he says "years afterward as she looks down toward the little gate she sees him; he has been given back by the sea." How intelligent! Denies that he believes in inspiration and then uses argument that proves inspiration.

You see it is just impossible for professed infidels to get along and not give themselves away—reveal their be-

lief in the Bible and inspiration. Ingersoll says, "Back of all honest creeds was, and is, a desire to know, to understand, and to explain, and that desire will, as I most fervently hope and earnestly believe, be gratified at last by the discovery of the truth." If Ingersoll in his mad career would stop and investigate his arguments he would be obliged to acknowledge that they reveal a belief in inspiration. Jesus Christ is the truth, the life and the way, and it is impossible for one to believe Ingersoll's statement which we have just quoted, without believing in inspiration. What is he arguing on? Theology. That word, truth, then, has reference to the origin and destiny of man. From that word arrives the questions how did man originate and whither is he tending? Has man a soul and will he exist after this life, and if so, will his life here affect his existence in the world to come and how? Was Jesus Christ both man and God and if we are saved must it be through him? "The discovery of the truth" concerning these things is what Ingersoll has reference to in that statement, because those were the things that he was discussing when he made the statement, and he says he earnestly believes that man will yet learn the facts of these important questions, so taking him at his own word he is a firm believer in inspiration, because the "truth" of which he speaks could never be made known to the world except through inspiration.

In the New York Journal, spoken of before, he speaks of "the first and second chapters of Genesis" as giving "two contradictory accounts of creation." He says, "We know that both accounts cannot be true unless they are inspired, and no man can believe them both unless he is inspired." Of course he wants to make himself out an inspired man, hence his object, I suppose, of giving us his two contradictory accounts on so many different sub-

jects. But notice his common-sense again. The idea that inspiration is going to make the truth out of a lie, or a lie out of the truth!

I read that statement "We know that in the first and second chapters of Genesis there are two contradictory accounts of creation" and thought to myself I will see about that, whereupon I set about reading them, and found Ingersoll "using his senses" just the same as usual. The second chapter, instead of being contradictory to the first, I find is merely explanatory of the first. The first chapter tells us that "God said, let the earth bring forth grass and herb-yielding seed," etc. "And the earth brought forth grass and herb-yielding seed after his kind;" while the second chapter explains that God caused to appear in the earth the different seeds and that they did not grow and bear the plant until the ground had been watered. The first chapter tells us that God made man: the second chapter explains to us that He formed him from the dust of the ground, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. The first chapter tells us that God made woman: the second chapter explains to us that He caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, took a rib from his side and therefrom created a helpmeet for man. Who says it requires a large amount of faith to believe these things? Allowed, for argument's sake; but how did the world appear, and how did man originate? There has not been a theory of evolution yet produced but it would require much more faith to believe than it does to believe the Bible record.

Ingersoll is not a scientist, he does not pretend to be, but he pretends to be the author of a gospel that will save the human race; (every good thing, however, to be found in what he calls his gospel, is taken from the gospel of Jesus Christ) although he says that "Science is the only

possible savior of the human race." I wish now that Mr. Ingersoll would tell us how it is, science being the only possible savior of the human race, that he, making no pretentions to being a scientist, can produce a gospel to do what he says nothing but science can possibly do. How can these two contradictory reports be true? Why, they are inspired, of course, and he must be inspired or he could not believe them both; or, to give you his other version of the matter, "by believing what he knows is not so he becomes a saint."

How can his two contradictory accounts concerning inspiration be true, and how can he believe them both? According to one of his versions they are inspired—or else one account is false, and he is inspired or he could not believe them both: according to his other version he believes what he knows is not so in order to be a saint. Just believing something he does not understand, that is all. How can his two contradictory accounts concerning the promise, "If we forgive our fellow-men God will forgive us," be true? In his first account he says, "I accept the terms;" in his other account he says, "We do not need the forgiveness of God." And again further on he says, "I do not destroy the promise 'If you will forgive others, God will forgive you;'" but in less than half a dozen pages from there comes the contradictory account destroying that promise, where he growls, "No forgiveness by the gods." Oh, that he would tell us which account to believe, or whether to believe them both, by inspiration, or count them both true, believing what we know is not so!

Let us for a moment do as he tells us, throw away inspiration. That done, there is no way left for us to believe the two contradictory accounts but to believe what we know is not so, and he says it is not intelligent to do

that, and in one place in the lecture he says, "intelligence must be the savior of this world." So where are we? We are in hell! Our doom is sealed! This wise fool tries to argue hell away, but he argues it into existence! He aims his shot and shell at Christianity; but he hits agnosticism!

CHAPTER IV.

FINAL BLOW TO INGERSOLL'S NO-FAITH GOSPEL.

The object of this Chapter (Ingersoll denying the necessity of believing in anything to be saved) is to show that he proves his own doctrine false, and that to be saved by his Gospel, Faith is an absolute necessity as much as though we accept the Bible Gospel. —Ingersoll's ways of being Saved.

I would like, just at this point, to draw your mind back to the first chapter of this book, and at the same time cite to you three or four more statements Ingersoll has made discarding the atonement and the necessity of faith. He says: "Nothing can be more wonderful than the fact that Matthew, Mark and Luke say nothing about salvation by faith; that they do not even hint at the doctrine of the atonement, and are as silent as empty tombs as to the necessity of believing anything to secure happiness in this world or another. From the temple of morality and truth, the parasitic and poisonous vines of faith must be torn. If a certain belief is necessary to insure the salvation of the soul, the church ought to explain, and without any unnecessary delay, why such an infinitely important fact was utterly ignored by Matthew, Mark and

Luke." You will remember that we examined the gospels a little in the first chapters of this book and found these statements empty and void.

He says, "They say," to him, "you must believe," to which he replies, "I say, no." And yet I never saw nor heard of a piece of printed matter where the author says, "I believe," one-quarter as much as Mr. Ingersoll does. If as he professes, he accepts the plan he has given us, for his salvation, he accepts it by faith and that leaves him with a belief, a belief that "a certain belief is necessary to insure the salvation of the soul," or else his statement that "Science is the only possible savior of the human race," must be branded with the false and ridiculous.

We believe that in Jesus Christ and his atonement the human race may find a Savior; and Ingersoll believes that in science only can the human race find a savior. Now, if we accept what he says must be our savior, we believe in something, and a definite something, just as much as though we accept the former. So whatever scheme of salvation we accept, it still remains to be accepted by faith. Mr. Ingersoll says he "believes that his gospel of intelligence, of health, good living, good fellowship etc., will bring life, and cover the world with wealthy, happy homes." He acknowledges that there is such a thing as being lost, because, if there is such a thing as being saved there must, of necessity be such a thing as being lost, and from a really intelligent and scientific standpoint this must be acknowledged in opposition—oppositeness; as, male, female; large, small; strong, weak; up, down; preserve, destroy; truthful, dishonest; God, Satan; heaven, hell; saved, lost. And if it be true that science is our only savior, to strike him with his own club, "Nothing can be more wonderful than the fact that such an in-

finitely important fact has been utterly ignored" by all infidelity, and in fact by all even who claim to discard the Bible; that it never was mentioned until Bob Ingersoll came into existence; that none of these "have ever hinted at the doctrine of salvation" by science, and that for about six thousand years "they were silent as empty tombs as to the necessity of believing" in science "to secure happiness in this world or another." And the human race will never resort to science for a savior unless they do believe it necessary.

Let us now, for argument, throw away the Bible scheme of salvation, and acknowledge that "Science is our only possible savior." Let us suppose that science has discovered the truth and can tell us just what to do, and how to do it, and that it can give us the power to do the things that will free us from all pain and sorrow, and bring us life, wealth and glorious happiness. The gospel of this savior, Science, must be preached to the world. Preachers and teachers should organize and spread the glad tidings from "sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." This savior must explain to us what to do in order that we may procure its blessings and we must accept it, and do the things it bids us do; and we will not accept it unless we believe in it. So this scheme of salvation, you see, requires just as much faith, and a particular faith in a particular something, as though we accept the Bible. But, hold! If Ingersoll's gospel be true, is it possible for us to come even to this savior which he has appointed? He says, "From the temple of morality and truth the parasitic and poisonous vines of faith must be torn." He appoints science as our only possible savior, and then makes it impossible for us to come and be saved.

Ingersoll would be a thousand times worse God than he has made out of what he calls the "Orthodox and Pres-

byterian gods." He is creating a worse hell than the one he aims to destroy.

Now, "if it should turn out that all of the professed" sceptics "in the world are sinless saints, the question of how" so infinitely important a fact as that, "science is our only possible savior," was not given to the world, even by way of prophecy, until this late hour, and of how science is to save us unless we come to it and accept, and of how we are to accept this scheme of salvation unless we accept it *by faith*, and of how we may believe whatever we happen to—rejecting science as a savior—and still be saved, if "Science is our only savior "would still be asked." "And if it should then be shown that all the" church people and believers in the Bible "are vile and vicious wretches, the question still would wait for a reply."

Infidelity "will be compelled at last to rest its case, not upon the wonders" science reveals, but upon salvation prepared for us by an all-wise Creator. "All the wonders" or great discoveries of science, "including the 'Nuremberg man' that 'was operated by a combination of pipes and levers' that 'could breathe and digest perfectly, and even reason' on God and the Bible better than infidelity, yet 'was made of nothing but wood and leather,'" are, when compared with breathing into man's nostrils, after having formed him, the breath of life, creating from that form a living soul, giving him free moral agency, providing as He has a way of redemption for sinful man, resurrecting to life a soul dead in trespasses and sins, and making a new creature of him, and giving us the witness of His Spirit, "but dust and darkness."

"If faith in a certain something"—science—"is necessary to insure our salvation," Ingersoll "ought to explain, and without any unnecessary delay, why such an infinitely important fact was utterly ignored" for so

long a time. He says of Matthew, Mark and Luke, "There are only two explanations possible: either belief is unnecessary, or the writers of these three gospels did not understand the Christian system." So we must say of Ingersoll's plan, "there are only two explanations possible:" Human science and faith therein is unnecessary, or God cruelly neglected to let the world know that they might be saved by science until this late hour, solely that he might give Ingersoll the infinite honor of being the chosen and inspired instrument to reveal such a wonderful fact to the world. "The" foolishness, the clearly defined falsity "of the subject cannot longer hide the absurdity of" such a "scheme of salvation," nor the failure of God and infidelity "to mention, what is now claimed to have been, the" great "mission of" Mr. Ingersoll and human science. "The Church" of Ingersoll, "must take from its testament" and creed, the supercilious notion that human inventions and discoveries, without inspiration, will ever redeem lost man. "The idea that an intellectual conviction can subject" this world "to eternal doom unless" saved by human science alone! "The awful doctrine that" science can atone for the crimes of guilty men, or that there can be any redemption for man without divine interposition!

I wish now to call your attention to a number of different accounts of Ingersoll's as to how we may be saved: Page 26 of the lecture, "Forgive and ye shall be forgiven." Page 85, "God cannot make a man miserable if that man has made somebody else happy." Last page of book, "the honest man, the good woman, the happy child have nothing to fear in this world or the next." Last words of letter to New York Journal, "Science is the only possible savior of the human race." In the first account he discards the Bible truth, that "God, for Christ's sake, will

forgive us," but simply says, if we excuse those who misuse us we are safe; not one word said about making somebody happy, or being good or honest, or believing in his gospel of education, or science, or humor. In the next account, if we will just go to work and make some person happy nothing can make us miserable. He does not mention the necessity of forgiving anybody, or believing in science, or being good or honest generally. In another account, if we are honest, or good, we are safe for time and eternity; he does not mention the necessity of education or science.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIANITY—BARBARISM.

Fall of Nations, Cause of.—This Republic Will Soon Go.

Again listen to Ingersoll: "We have what they call the Christian religion, and I find, just in proportion that nations have been religious, just in proportion they have clung to the religion of their founders, they have gone back to barbarism." Notice now, by saying, "gone back to barbarism," he acknowledges that some nations have been lifted out of barbarism, but he does not tell us by what means. It would be idiotic to say that barbarism lifted them out of barbarism, and that being the case it would be worse than idiotic to say that they were not lifted out by a good religion. The only rational decision then, that remains for any sane man is this: Just in proportion that nations have fallen below the standard of real piety (no matter how high their profession, for profession does not necessarily imply possession) just in that proportion has oppression prevailed, and have they slid back to barbarity, not through piety and godliness; but by a lack of piety. It is a true saying that "Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any peo-

ple." He continues: "I find that Spain, Portugal and Italy are the three worst nations in Europe. I find that the nation nearest infidel is the most prosperous—France." As to the first three suppose it is true, it is but a clear manifestation of ignominy to say that Christianity is the cause of ther being so bad. It is a lack of the vitals of Christianity. It is the fruits of hypocricy gone to seed, covered with the beautiful garb of piety, Christianity existing only in name, of which Christ said, "the platter is clean without, but within it is full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."

According to what Ingersoll says, all nations which these many years have been found in a good state of civilization will soon be swallowed up in barbarism, for he says, "We have what they call the Christian religion, and I find just in proportion that nations have been religious, just in proportion they have clung to the religion of their founders' they have gone back to barbarism:"

Nations that have reached the highest state of civilization have been thus exalted by making use of principles of the religion of the Bible; and just in proportion that they have denied the God of the Bible, and refused to walk in those ways have they seen trouble; and anybody with but very little knowledge of these things knows my statement true. Consider our own country, our loved United States. What exalted so small a nation above all nations of earth? Was it not a larger amount of the religion of the Bible than existed anywhere else? And just in proportion as this nation is departing from the faith and piety of its founders, letting go of true piety and giving place to hypocricy, is it meeting its doom.

How devoid of all reason is the idea that where the most religion is, there, is the most barbarity! It is impossible to name a nation or a people without a religion

of some kind. Ingersoll has his religion; but he rejects the only true religion and formulates one of his own. He is as religious (in his way) as we are, he studies our Bible and our writings in search of material wherewith to propagate his own religion; and whenever he finds anything in the Bible that can be used against him he growls, "Interpolation!"

The Bible is the only system of religion that renounces idolatry, unless it is Mohammedanism, and that professes to be founded on our Bible, and there is but one system professing Christianity that holds to idolatry—its images—the Roman Catholic. Organized peoples, almost without number, have met their doom for holding to idolatry, and rejecting the God of the Bible, just as God in the word said they would; and those that have not already, will in the near future. The United States will, in the very near future, be torn to pieces, and cease to be a republic, not because of its molten images or its piety; but because of its hypocricy, its social, political and financial treachery.

CHAPTER VI.

FRANCE.

Infidelity's heinous work.—Dissolute girl to take the place of Deity—Infidelity of France causing fulfillment of prophecy, etc. etc.

Now for France! Read from Ingersoll again: "I find that the nation nearest infidel is the most prosperous—France." Considering our answer to this we must connect another statement from the same lecture, namely: "I believe in the gospel of intelligence." Further on he calls it "My gospel of intelligence." He says also, "That is the only lever capable of raising mankind. Intelligence must be the savior of this world." He points us to infidel France as an example.

Ingersoll has told us what he finds about infidel France, now let us see what we can find. I find that no nation was ever so prosperous in its widely extended influences of the baneful effects of infidelity as France. I find that the cruelties and butcherings of war were never more plainly manifest than in the French Revolution, planned and executed by infidelity, with Voltaire, one of the most noted infidels that ever lived, and four or five

others to lead the van in the beginning of the crusade that led to the French Revolution.

This Voltaire you know was the infidel who said: "I am tired of hearing it said that twelve men established the Christian religion; I will show that one man can suffice to overthrow it." And so by this intellectual giant of infidelity, with his four colleagues: Frederic II, Prussia's king; Diderot, D'Alembert, and Rousseau, a plot was formed, by all the deceit and treachery that intelligence with infidelity and irreverence were able to muster, for the purpose of uprooting Christianity and blotting it off the face of the earth. And all this, understand, by the intelligence of Infidel France, the nation that Ingersoll holds up to us as a model.

This Voltaire (I quote from "Guizot's History of France") when planning the crusade against Christianity, "was taking the communion to soften the Jesuits and was conforming to the rules of a convent. He wrote to D'Alembert: 'I assure you that my friends and I will lead them a fine dance; they shall drink the cup to the very lees. In the great campaign against Christianity undertaken by the philosophers, Voltaire, so long a wavering ally, will henceforth fight in the foremost ranks; it is he who shouts to Diderot, squelch the thing! The masks are off and the fight is bare-faced; the encyclopaedists'—he was helping write an encyclopaedia—'march out to the conquest of the world, in the name of reason, humanity and free thinking; even when he has ceased to work at the encyclopaedia, Voltaire marches with them.'" And behold the result!

Louis XV was king of France for over fifty years previous to that terrible revolutionary outbreak. Some of his advisers warned him of the impending fate of the nation, and urgently insisted upon a reformation; and lis-

ten to his cold and indifferent reply: "Try to make things go on as long as I am likely to live; after my death it may be as it will." To no purpose did they remonstrate with him. Clearly could he realize the gathering of the fateful clouds that were soon to break out in their fury; and here are the words in which he portrayed the fate of a nation that had gone over to infidelity: "After me the deluge." The deluge came. When that revolution first began the king yielded to the idea of allowing the commonalty a larger delegation in the legislature than was held by the Nobility and Romish priests together, so that the heavier part of law-making material rested with them. This, however, did not pacify them. They were blood thirsty, and blood they would spill! They were bent on the annihilation of Christianity. They were determined to butcher the classes (Catholics and politicians) that had butchered so many before them, because they would not acknowledge the supremacy of the beast (the Pope). They followed the example of Catholicism in their endeavors to suppress the Bible. Christianity, for a short season, in all nations, was lashed by the bitter fangs of foul-mouthed infidelity. Infidel France became the mother of the malignant pool of agnosticism; that gigantic cess-pool overflowed its banks and spread its virus from sea to sea.

The work of Infidel France and the Roman Beast seems to answer to the prophecy of the first part of the eleventh chapter of Revelation, verse 3, "And I will give power unto my two witnesses" (which must mean the two Testaments that make up the Bible) "and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days (years—Num. 14:34; Ez. 4:6) "clothed in sackcloth."

The period of 1260 years in which the two witnesses (the Old and New Testaments) should prophesy, clothed

in sackcloth, had reference to the centuries that the real believers in Christ were to receive their worst persecutions and crimes from Roman Catholics, and when Rome would do the most in keeping the Bible, the two witnesses, from the hands of the people. So the supreme authority of popedom beginning A. D. 538, 1798 must bring that 1260 years to its terminus. It was right at this point that a large band of French warriors stormed the vatican, took the pope prisoner, and held him in banishment until the time of his death. It was not long before another pope was placed in his stead, but that infamous beast, popedom, received a blow from which it has not fully recovered, and the power which it employed during that 1260 years it never has been permitted to employ again.

But this awfully cruel exercise of power, by Rome, however, was greatly subdued shortly before the close of the 1260 years. Why? (See Matt. 24th—Ch. first 22 verses). Christ in speaking of it said, "Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

It is plain enough that the two witnesses are the two Testaments of the Bible. The next verse of Rev. II, speaking of them says, "These are the two olive-trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth." The prophet Zechariah saw the two olive trees, one on either side of the golden candlesticks upon which was a bowl with seven lamps thereon, the seven lamps being the same as the seven candlesticks that represent the seven churches of Asia, in Rev. 1st chapter. And the Old and New Testament, represented by the two witnesses in Rev. II, and by the two olive trees in Zech. 4, were seen by the prophet, one on each side of the lamps, or churches, because upon the two Testaments is the Church of Christ founded. The prophet asked the meaning of the two

olive trees and the angel answered: "This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by night, nor by power, but my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." Again he asks the same question of the olive trees and the olive branches, and again the angel answers: "These are the two annointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth," while John says, Rev. 11:4, "Standing before the God of the earth." The same statement you see.

Verse 7: "And when they" (the two witnesses) shall have finished their testimony," (in sackcloth, Rome's greatest persecutions ceasing) "the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them" (the two witnesses) "and shall overcome them, and kill them." What is the meaning of that?

Picture to yourself as vividly as possible the appalling condition of the minds of infidels who have left a record of their condition, when professing infidelity, and see if you can conceive of anything more applicable than a beast in a bottomless pit, and think of France as a nation given over to infidelity.

Infidel France, the nation that Ingersoll holds up to us as a model, at the time of the French Revolution, in 1773, deliberately unsheathed its sword of infidelity and brought to pass the saying of this prophecy, by assassinating these two witnesses.

After the intellectual giants of infidelity flatly refused to take the reins of government in peace and quietude, in debasement and cruelty through the appalling scenes of the Revolution captured the government, and on the meeting of the legislature passed a resolution that there was no God, and passed a prohibitory law, for the suppression of the Bible, prohibiting the printing and circulation of holy writ, and this act was the murdering of the Two

Witnesses which, for a number of centuries, had been prophesying "clothed in sackcloth"—under most adverse circumstances. By this act, together with gathering and destroying of Bibles already printed, abolishing the day of rest, setting apart one day in ten for blasphemous carousing; prohibiting of the sacrament, of baptismal rites and the worship of God, and, in fact, by the use of all means possible they intended to annihilate Christianity. But God had said, "My word shall not return unto me void, but shall accomplish that whereunto it was sent."

Verse 8: "And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." In this passage you can plainly see it was shown to the prophet that the nation which should hush the voice of the scriptures, (the two witnesses), was to distinctly represent Sodom's lasciviousness, the atheistical heart of Egypt, and the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus. The moral corruption of Sodom is well known. The infidelity of Egypt was made manifest in Pharo's reply to Moses: "Who is Jehovah, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah, neither will I let Israel go." During the Revolution the astounding exclamation of the spirit of Infidel France was heard resounding through the land that Christ was a deception, an imposition, and they capped the climax by the ridiculing fiendish shouts of "Crush the wretch!"

a. "Their dead bodies shall lie in the street" is explained in the fact that France, in her infidelity, had not only gathered and destroyed the printed copies of the Bible, but had by law prohibited the scriptures, thus stopping the mouth of those "two witnesses" so that they met their death blow; and for nearly four years God's immutable word of truth lay prostrate through the length

and breadth of a land whose people despised religious and moral restraint.

b. "Which spiritually is called Sodom" is explained in the fact that France sunk to deeper depths of moral and religious corruption than Sodom did.

c. "Which spiritually is called Egypt" is explained in the fact that France rebelled against the Almighty, in both word and deed, in a manner that equalled, or excelled, that of Egypt. A priest connected with the leaders voiced the sentiments of the nation that Ingersoll holds up to us as a model, and also of Egypt of old, in the following words: "God, if you exist, avenge your injured name. I bid you defiance! You remain silent! You dare not launch your thunders! Who, after this, will believe in your existence?"

d. "Where also our Lord was crucified" is explained by Infidel France' having pronounced imposition upon the name of Christ, and in the maddened furies of the Revolution calling upon one another to "Crush the Wretch!"

Verse 9: "And they of the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations, shall see their dead bodies three days and a half"—three and one half years, (Num. 14:34; Eze. 4:6) "and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves." This is explained by the fact that the evil influences of infidelity that were thundering on through France in uncontrollable velocity were felt for a time, through all nations, so that the people, kindreds, tongues and nations, beheld the evil effects of infidelity emanating from France, for three and one half years, which was the time that the national resolution to the effect that there was no God; and the law prohibiting the scriptures and the worship of God, which was the killing of the two witnesses—remained upon the statute books.

Verse 10: "And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them,"—the death of the two witnesses—"and make merry, and send gifts one to another; because these two Prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth." This was fulfilled by the universal rejoicing over the reign of infidelity and the death of these "two witnesses,"—the war against the Bible (prohibiting its sale) and Christianity, which the leaders set out to completely destroy. One day in ten was set apart for carousing and making merry; and when the news was heralded that the legislators of France had resolved against God, and passed a law prohibiting His word—the Bible—men and women became jubilant in dancing, and in singing, because they were anxious to be counted free from all moral obligation, and proposed that nothing should restrain them from worldliness and sensuality.

Verse 11: "And after three days and a half"—three and one half years—"the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them." God had said that His word should abide forever. Although Infidel France had been permitted to deal it—the two witnesses—a death blow, it was not suffered to be buried and lost in oblivion; and this passage was fulfilled when, in just three and one half years from the time that Infidel France ruthlessly thundered a resolution through its legislature denying the existence of the Deity, revoked that resolution. It was fulfilled when, in just three and one half years from the passage of the law prohibiting the scriptures, that law was repealed, and the circulation of the Bible permitted. A scriptural proverb reads: "They hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord; therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices." They had found it true. Smitten

with horror, all civilization, France as high in the list as any nation, in awful amazement gazed upon the horrifying atrocities that sprung from renouncing the book of divine revelation, the word of infinite wisdom! Even the very legislative assembly that had thus declared against God and his word, seeing the outcome began to realize that the mighty word of supreme excellence and its beautiful teachings, must be restored to a lost people, and as a last resort, and the only means to save their own nation from everlasting revolt and destruction, they rescinded their own infidel resolution and law. Thus were the "two witnesses" endowed with greater power and more life apparently than ever they had been before, so that "great fear fell upon them which saw them"—the multitudes who had been exultant over the apparent defeat of the Bible, and abolition of Christianity, on seeing them placed upon their feet, and exalted to a higher station in their midst, than ever before, were filled with fearfulness before their Creator.

So much for Mr. Ingersoll's "I find that the nation nearest infidel, is the most prosperous—France." So much for his "Gospel of Intelligence," which he says "is the only lever capable of raising mankind," and which "must be the savior of this world," preached and carried into effect by the nation that he holds up to us as a model. They had intelligence enough, however, to see what they had done, and acknowledged it to the world, by repealing their infidel resolution and law. Look again at the

COLOSSAL INTELLIGENCE (reason) of INFIDELITY!

France having rejected the veneration of the Deity, the God of the universe, the nation was soon swallowed up in the most lewd idolatry. A dissolute female was pre-

sented to the great and intelligent legislative body of France as the one object worthy their highest regards, and this their worship of intelligence they called the "Goddess of Reason."

A formal rite, of these licentious and idolatrous worshippers of intelligence, certainly appears to the world unequalled in folly, immorality and irreverence. Those of the city government, followed by a company of musical experts, marched deliberately, and yet solemnly, into the presence of the conventionists—made up, understand, of the supreme civic and authoritative body of the land—and at once began their worship by the use of an appropriate song which rung out their praises of freedom—what they called freedom—and accompanied by the deified woman with face concealed in the usual female style, to be accepted as the one Being worthy their highest honors, their best love, their deepest affection, yea! their profound adoration. On being presented to this august, yet infidel assembly, Ingersoll's essence of intelligence, she was given a conspicuous position at the president's right, her veil was removed, her beautiful form exhibited, and most of them knew her to be an operatic dancer. And so that infidel company of legislators publicly greeted with reverential worship their "Goddess of Reason," humbly acknowledging her to be the most appropriate personification of the intelligence which they adored. Such ludicrous mimicry! And yet all through the country did those who were anxious to publicly sanction the atrocities of the Revolution, ape their intelligent leaders and vest their lady with the deified title of "Goddess of Reason."

Introductory to the adoration of intelligence the eloquent speaker selected to present the Goddess to that company poured out his torrent of eloquence in part, by call-

ing on weak humanity no longer to stand in apprehension of danger from the God who had been begotten by their own cowardice; and forever after to let reason be the only divine essence they should recognize. He said, "Fall before the august senate of freedom, veil of reason." "I offer you its noblest and purest image." He called her, "This animated image, the masterpiece of creation." How much indeed, is this like Ingersoll! France called it "Reason," he calls it intelligence, while both had reference to the same element in man; and yet neither France nor Robert Ingersoll, with all their intelligence, exercise enough of that most excellent attribute to acknowledge the supremacy and worthiness of the Creator and giver of these good gifts. Both place women above the Almighty. Both propose to revel in the gifts and forget the giver. How then can we read what Ingersoll says about intelligence, and then his statement, "It is far more important to love your wife than to love God," without knowing that had he been in France at that time he would have been a leader in that infamous move?

He comes down hard on hypocrisy (so did Christ) yet how [can one manifest blacker and more open hypocrisy than does Ingersoll in warring against Christianity, and pronouncing it a fake, without having put it to the test himself. Let him speak to God in earnest prayer. Let him say "thank you" to God. Let the prison bars of "I Am" burst asunder and his soul pour forth a torrent of praises to his Creator and see with what greater power he would be vested to help "his wife enjoy the perfumes of life." I defy him to test Christianity and remain an unbeliever.

But what do you think now of Ingersoll's Infidel France? It was the intelligent infidels of France who made it impossible for friends and neighbors to meet in saluta-

tion, or kneel in prayer, lest they be found out, and both counted and treated as criminals. It was the intelligent infidels of France who prepared and used the guillotine, a machine to quickly sever a person's head from the body. It was the intelligent infidels of France who were so smart as to gather their victims so rapidly that they could not work their infernal machine fast enough. It was the intelligent infidels of France who refused to peaceably take the reins of government, when offered them at the opening of the Revolution, but continued their wretched work until the streams that poured their contents into the river Seine were made frothy by the life-giving fluid from human veins; that devastated Lyons to but a wilderness; that lined the river Loire, a long distance from the ocean, with nude bodies of human beings, frightfully twisted about each other and furnishing festal enjoyment for multitudes of kites and crows. It was the intelligent infidels of France who kept up that awful Revolution for ten long years, during which time, millions were slaughtered; and his Infidel France has had a revolution once in about ten years ever since.

The intelligent infidels of France made another law, which may be called a very near relative of the laws against the Bible and Christianity, in which they disapproved matrimonial vows, so that the marriage contract amounted to only a simple agreement to which a couple might subscribe and live as man and wife as long as life was spared them, or separate as soon as they pleased, and the result was a degradation and inward corruption of the home circle and of society never known in that land before. It is a well known fact that the bodies of ten thousand infants have been taken from the sewers of the city of Paris alone in a single year.

It is a well known fact, or ought to be at any rate,

that Infidel France is the mother of anarchy, and that organized anarchists of France, have been preaching their doctrine for years, and are doing more of late than ever before, to spread its doctrines and organize anarchistic bodies in other nations. It is a well known fact, or ought to be at any rate, that in Infidel France as in no other nation on earth, are the public rulers in danger of losing their life at the hands of an enraged populace.

Ingersoll exceedingly degrades the real spirit of Catholicism, and to be sure it is right that he should. He says, "I love Catholics but hate Catholicism." That is good also, but he does not consider the fact that the Roman Catholic church is the mother of his infidelity in France. Surely there is no consistency in holding France up to the world as a model nation and ascribing the glory of the nation to infidelity and then flinging, with all his might, his "Anathama Maranatha" at the very organization—the Roman Catholic church—that led France into infidelity and gave it the exalted place among nations that he claims for it. If it were true, as he clains, that infidel doctrines had made France a truly prosperous people, then certainly the influences that made France an infidel nation should be highly extolled, and lovingly and adorably honored by all. But it is a fact that Catholicism led the people of France on to infidelity, and infidelity brought on the outrages which the world has called "The Reign of Terror." A Catholic bishop in a legislative assembly in France openly avowed the system of religion which he had taught so long to be but a method of religious trickery, without historical or Biblical foundation; and denied the existence of the Lord God whom he had worshipped, and to whose service he had been solemnly dedicated; the adorning ornaments of his bishopric were laid aside, and a goodly number of Cat-

holic priests performed the same act of infidelity. Furthermore, history shows that where the real spirit of Roman Catholicism sways a people, the general trend of the better intellects is toward infidelity. And don't forget this important fact; whatever degree of prosperity may exist in France (or any other nation, as for that matter) that prosperity was brought about by the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ, it matters not whether those principles were carried into effect by Christians or infidels. Whatever can be found in Infidel France that is good and noble, that is worthy our respect and adoration, depend upon it, the gospel of Christ teaches that.

History shows that "where France, under the influence of Romanism, had set up the first stake at the opening of the Reformation, there the Revolution set up its first guillotine" under the influence of infidelity. "On the very spot where the first martyrs to the Protestant faith were burned in the sixteenth century," under the influence of Romanism, "the first victims were guillotined in the eighteenth" under the influence of infidelity.

True, in the Revolution, they stormed their infuriated vengeance in a degree upon Romanists, millionaires and corrupt politicians who were sorely oppressing them (and we cannot blame the revolutionists so much as their oppressors) yet revolutionary company fought revolutionary company, France was made an immense territory of uproaring multitudes, swerved in paths of anarchy and riot by their violently irritated passions, and the inhabitants of the city of Paris stood aghast at the deadly work of the numerous divisions that took place among themselves until it appeared as though they could not be satisfied with anything less than reciprocal destruction. Of all the divisions

of the city, every company was against every company, and every company seemed determined to kill every other company.

What think you of Ingersoll's model and prosperous infidel country? What think you of France' Infidel Intelligence?

CHAPTER VII.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLIGENCE.

Crime a Mistake—Every Good Thing in His Gospel Taken from Gospel of Christ—Difference in Worldly and True Wisdom—Ingersoll Shows Same Hypocrisy Towards and Crucifies the Same Christ as Hypocrites of Old.

The undertaking to convert the world to political and priestly oppression, with chain and with whip; with dungeon and sword: with ax and fagot, was not by men who were unlearned, ignorant or unintelligent; but by the men who were universally acknowledged to have the most learning and the best intellects in the land. What, then, was lacking? True piety. The religion of Jesus Christ. Reason was not sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Those crimes took place, not in the dark ages, not at a time in which scientists were unknown in that land; but during an illustrious period when science and human skill were tilled and cultured; when the printing press was doing a good work; and when the ministers of Catholicism, of law and of politics, who were the leaders in the awful crimes, were noted for their learning, their oratory, their eloquence and their intelligence. So it was in the great

Infidel Revolution, the leaders in those gigantic riots were noted for their learning and intelligence. The greater the intelligence of a person the greater the evil he will accomplish if he takes that course.

Ingersoll's "Gospel of Intelligence," you see, which he says "must be the savior of this world," being "the only lever capable of raising mankind" is "weighed in the balances and found wanting." Mere intelligence falls far short of making anything like a complete gospel. Yet "Give us intelligence" he says, and "in a little while a man will find that he cannot steal without robbing himself. He will find that he cannot murder without assassinating his own joy. He will find that every crime is a mistake." From time immemorial the very people that this man Ingersoll pronounces superstitious, unlearned, unscientific and unintelligent, idiotic and insane, have been preaching those very things, namely: that men cannot rob, murder or commit any kind of crime without injuring self and bringing sorrow and displeasure upon self, and "assassinating his own joy," for that is a part of Christ's gospel; and now Mr. Ingersoll comes forth after these many centuries and tells us that it is his "gospel of intelligence." What folly is this! What nonsense indeed, to come from the lips of a man who poses as an intellectual giant! Publishers who have printed books purporting to contain Ingersoll's lectures, doing him an injustice, he calls wretches, literary thieves and pirates; but in what he calls his gospel, there is not a good thing to be found but he has taken from the gospel of Jesus Christ, but of course he is no wretch, literary thief nor pirate.

Read this. Re-read it. Meditate upon it. Some of the more unintelligent people are much more sensitive to all wrong-doing, and are much more careful not to do wrong than some of our brightest and most intellectual

people. And many of the smarter ones look down upon a righteous person and say, "He don't amount to much, he is too good and honest." Intelligence and education of a worldly nature do not make righteousness.

"In a little while," he says, "men will find these things out." Poor, miserable humanity! I wonder where he will leave ninety-nine out of every hundred of us. "In a little while"! Thank God we have not to wait for Robert's "savior." No, no, our Savior does not put us off till some future time. Our Savior does not say, "Get learning and I will save you." He does not say, "Get an education and then I will save you." He does not say, "Develop into intellectual men and women and then I will save you." He never said, "Develop into a logician and a philosopher and then I will save you." But he did say, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." These things? What things? The mysteries of godliness. Paul has well expressed it: "Great is the mystery of godliness." Paul has also spoken correctly of these babes of whom Christ speaks, as "Ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." The mighty workings of the mysteries of godliness have been wrought, largely, by those whom the world have not counted very wise or intelligent. As Paul said to the Corinthians: "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are: That no flesh should glory in his

presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." There, you see, is a wisdom that is worth something. That will stand the test of time and of eternity. That is the wisdom that means righteousness, sanctification, and redemption—when? "In a little while?" No. After we have become scientific? No. After we have become educated and highly intelligent? No. Our Savior says: "Come unto me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; take my yoke upon you, and learn of me for I am meek and lowly of heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls." And a meek and lowly Jesus is the only kind that could possibly have accomplished his mission as a Savior to this world. Had he paraded his worldly science, wisdom and intelligence, his mission to a perishing world would have been a failure.

Ingersoll says he wants "it so that when a poor woman rocks the cradle and sings a lullaby to the dimpled darling, she will not be compelled to believe that ninety-nine chances out of a hundred she is raising kindling wood for hell." But if Christ's gospel were like his, which says, "Come unto me you who have large intellects, who have a great education and have become philosophical and scientific," then certainly more than ninety-nine out of every hundred of our dear mothers, these centuries past, would have known that they were raising kindling wood for hell. But our Savior is not the one to put us off because we have small intellectual faculties. Listen to the call! "Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the water, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy without money and without price," for saith He: "I am the bright and morning star. And the spirit and the bride say, come. And let him that heareth say,

come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

Talk about intelligence, wisdom? That exceedingly wise and intelligent man highly exalts wisdom and understanding; and at the beginning of his proverbs he says, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge," and he repeats it in the ninth chapter: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Surely Solomon was well prepared to speak thus, for in the beginning of his great career he feared the Lord, and God made him the wisest of men, so "There came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom." See I Kings, 3:5-15; and I Kings, 4:29-34.

Hear now the testimony of another great leader in Israel, found in the 119 Psalm: "O how I love thy law! it is my meditation all the day. Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies. I have more understanding than all my teachers:" Why? "For thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients." Why? "Because I keep thy precepts. Through thy precepts I get understanding. How sweet are thy words unto my taste! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth." And a truth worth considering lies in the fact that the miraculous operating of the Holy Spirit in the soul of man stirs every fiber in his being, and an earnest prayerful study of the Bible tends to powerfully enlarge the intellect (speaking even from the standpoint of logic, and intelligence) and the true spirit thereof leads that logic and intelligence into paths of godliness.

The Jews, you know, wanted a sign; and during Paul's great work Greece was the most noted country in the world in science and philosophy, hence it is that Paul

says in his letter to the Corinthians, "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."

Christ "sent me," says Paul, "to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of no effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

"And I, brethren, when I came unto you, came not with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom; but in demonstration of the spirit, and of power. That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. Howbeit, we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, that comes to naught: But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory."

Ingersoll tells us that the life of this Jesus; whom we call "the Lord of glory," "was destroyed by hypocrites, who have in all ages, done what they could to trample freedom and manhood out of the human mind." We all believe in "honor to whom honor is due," and so must

exclaim, all credit to him for an honest statement! True, the life of Christ was destroyed by hypocrites, and bear in mind, those hypocrites, according to both sacred and profane history were "princes of this world." They were able scholars, efficient in knowledge, and highly intelligent; but they were hypocrites just the same, and their wisdom—intelligence — came to naught. And why? Because their wisdom, like Ingersoll's, was the "wisdom of this world," and they used it for purely selfish purposes. Their learning and intelligence did not save them. Their education and worldly wisdom did not make them merciful, and kind, and good. Nay, their very intelligence, worldly wisdom, was the cause of their crucifying the Son of God. Why such merciless, cruel, and selfish wisdom? It was of a sensual, worldly nature. It was not sanctified by divine grace. Had they but opened their minds as a receptacle of the mysterious wisdom which cometh from above, we are told that "they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory." But in the natural state their minds could not be made a receptacle for the wisdom of righteousness because "The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God." Their minds were in perfect accord with Mr. Ingersoll's inasmuch as "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him." Their minds were in perfect accord with Ingersoll's inasmuch as their blackest hypocrisy lay in the same fact, namely: they warred against the real underlying principles of Christianity without testing Christianity for themselves. Yes, Ingersoll's mind is in perfect accord with the hypocrites who took the life of Christ inasmuch as he crucifies the same Jesus that they crucified.

He says, "For the man Christ I have infinite respect. To that great and serene man I pay; I gladly pay, the tribute of my admiration and my tears. He

was regarded as a blasphemer" etc. "That," he says, "is for the man." But "for the theological creation I have a different feeling." Then he goes on with a little nonsense which he considers proof against the Divinity of Christ, that he was nothing more than a man. What said Pilate when the chief priests (princes) in company with the multitudes visciously, and derisively, and vehemently cried, "Crucify him?" He said the same that Ingersoll now says, "I find no fault in this man." Notice now, "in this man." Pilate did not ask him, "Hast thou all power in heaven and earth?" He did not ask him, "Art thou equal with God?" nor any of those things. He simply asked him, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" referring simply to a political leader of an earthly kingdom. But Christ had said: "I and my Father are one. I am the light of the world. I am the way, the truth and the life. I am the Son of God." Then was it that they called him a hypocrite. It was the Christ who said these things that they called the blasphemer. It is the Christ who claims those things of himself that Ingersoll calls a hypocrite and a blasphemer. It was the Christ who claimed to be sent by the Father as a divine offering for us, that they crucified, and it is the same Christ that Mr. Ingersoll crucifies. Here is what he says in speaking of what the Presbyterian church teaches: "That church teaches that Infinite Innocence was sacrificed for me." And then he deliberately adds, "I do not want it." Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is the "Infinite Innocence" that he speaks of as being "sacrificed for me" and which he openly and willfully rejects, saying, "I do not want it."

When this Jesus said, "I am the Son of God, sent to save the lost," the hypocrites who took his life cried, "blasphemer." When this Jesus says, "I, Infinite Innocence do give myself a ransom (sacrifice myself) for you, de-

praved and wicked man," Ingersoll answers, "Imposter! I do not want you." I fail, therefore, to see the consistency in telling us that those who took the life of Jesus Christ were "hypocrites who have, in all ages, done what they could to trample freedom and manhood out of the human mind," when he, at the sound of "I am the Son of God" or any intimation that Christ was more than man, or that he was vested with divine power, pronounces him the same fake that hypocrites of old did; and then set himself up as a model of logic and intelligence and honesty. I would like to see him harmonize such plain contradictions. I frankly admit that it would require the logic of a most gigantic intellect.

CHAPTER VIII.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLIGENCE CONTINUED.

Blasphemy — Dungeon of Mind — Traitors—Liberty—"Men Loved Darkness."

Speaking of blasphemy he says: "Priests have invented a crime called blasphemy, and behind that crime hypocrisy has crouched for thousands of years. There is but one blasphemy, and that is injustice. There is but one worship, and that is justice."

All blasphemy is injustice but all injustice is not blasphemy. Lay religion and the Bible right one side. Acknowledge the morality and justice that Ingersoll talks about, to be his gospel just as he calls it. Preach it to the most degraded and vilest of sinners. They will come to a point in their lives when they will accept or reject once and forever.

Many there are who have been conscious of having arrived at a critical moment in their life, a moment in which they knew by the "sacred light" of reason, inspiration and conscience, that they must decide, for all time be-

tween justice and injustice, between morality and immorality. Some have treated unjustly that sacred light at the critical moment and have never again realized the power and ability of reforming. Are not these facts evidence enough for any rational being that blasphemy is not a priestly invention, but a stern reality, a fact in nature, in perfect accord with that "gospel of justice," as he himself calls it, that "We must reap what we sow?"

Speaking of reason and freedom of thought, he says: "Fear is the dungeon of the mind, and you need not fear the anger of a God that you cannot injure. Courage is liberty. Only those are traitors who resort to brute force. Do not imagine that there is any being who would give to his children the holy torch of reason, and then damn them for following that sacred light."

True, a mind in fear is in a dungeon, but fear alone is anything but a good definition for "dungeon-of-the-mind." Guilt (a guilty conscience) is the "dungeon of the mind." What deeper hell, what blacker dungeon can the mind be in than when lashed with the galling stripes of guilt? Men are afraid to come face to face with God, not because they fear God, because they think He is a tyrant, unmerciful and unkind; but because of their guilt. Sin is what makes men afraid and forces the mind into a dungeon-hell. A real Christian has nothing to fear. The unrepentant sinner is not afraid that God will bring him to an unjust judgment; but he is afraid of his own inner conscience. He is afraid of himself. He knows that God is acquainted with his every thought, word, intention, desire, act and deed, and is afraid not of God; but of his real self. He is not afraid that his Creator will do him injustice; but he is afraid that his just deserts will be meted out to him.

Wrong your neighbor to-day and you do not care anything about meeting him to-morrow unless you are really penitent for the wrong. Why? What's the matter? Guilt.

Thieves, robbers, murderers, adulterers, liars, are walking in society among men. While committing their inhumanly and treacherous deeds how on the alert are they! What's the matter? Guilt. At the slightest sound they are all unnerved! Every fiber of their being is thrown into active motion! Every nerve is set vibrating and they are afraid! What's the matter? Guilt. Sin makes the "dungeon of the mind." In their every-day walk if they see an officer coming towards them they are afraid. Point your finger towards them and they are in trouble. What's the matter? Guilt. If they see you talking with somebody as in secret and you look towards them they are in trouble. At the sound of a wagon they are startled for fear the officer is on their track. What's the matter? Guilt, sin. He is afraid of that "gospel of justice," which Ingersoll claims to believe in, that "We must reap what we sow." Yes, Wrong-doing makes the "dungeon of the mind."

How strikingly has the great poet portrayed these truths!

"Stand still, my soul, in the silent dark,
I would question thee,
Alone in the shadow drear and stark
With God and me.

What, my soul, was thy errand here?
Was it mirth and ease,
Or heaping up dust from year to year?
"Nay, none of these!"

What hast thou done, O soul of mine,
That thou tremblest so?
Hast thou wrought His task, and kept the line
He bade thee go?

Back to thyself is measured well
All thou hast given;
Thy neighbor's wrong is thy present hell,
His bliss, thy heaven."

Whittier.

All these things Mr. Ingersoll really acknowledges on page 86 of his lecture. He says: "Give us intelligence. In a little while a man will find that he cannot steal without robbing himself, murder without assassinating his own joy, and that every crime is a mistake." That is good. The simplicity lies in his calling for intelligence and then manifesting so little of it himself. He calls it his gospel. "My gospel, My gospel, My gospel; My doctrine, My My doctrine," he says time after time on that same page. As though he were preaching something new, of his own manufacture. As though all ministers did not now and had not always preached that. God gave that to Moses on Mount Sinai. Jesus Christ preached it all his life time. Yea! the vilest of sinners preach it.

And then notice he says, "*In a little while*" men will find out those things. As though men did not know it already. Yea, men have acknowledged it ever since man was created, "their conscience bearing them witness."

"*My gospel.*" "*In a little while.*" *How silly! How devoid of all reason and truth!!*

Then the idea that we cannot do God an injustice! If I were to go into Mr. Ingersoll's home and do some mischief and injure his family he would say that I was injuring him. In some of his arguments he acknowledges

that God is our maker, that we are his creatures, and that being a fact, it is anything but intelligent to say that we can injure God's creatures, our fellowmen, without doing God an injustice.

Then the way and the place in which he has put in, "Courage is liberty," gives us plainly to understand that courage is salvation; but intelligence certainly does not teach that. Everybody is courageous in some directions. He tells us, referring to Catholicism, that for years, "Those who plowed divided with those who prayed. Wicked industry supported pious idleness, the hut gave to the cathedral, and frightened poverty gave even its rags to buy a robe for hypocrisy." Now if his "Courage is liberty" then the leaders in that terrible wickedness had true liberty and their souls are now saved, because they certainly had courage.

He tells us further: "Thousands of volumes could not contain the crimes of the Catholic Church. Thousands and thousands have perished in dungeons and in fire. Millions have suffered agonies." And yet if his "Courage is liberty," be true, then the perpetrators of those untold crimes and agonies were men of great freedom and liberty. In other words, they enjoyed a saving religion, because it took large intelligence and great courage for the few to successfully carry out such gigantic schemes against the many.

The oppressors of the poor to-day are intelligent and courageous. Robbers and murderers have a great deal of courage, of a certain kind, or they could not take the course they do against civil law, against divine law and against conscience. If "Courage is liberty" then liquor dealers must be blessed with great liberty, for it must require a large amount of courage thus to deal out that liquid fire that is the source of so much wretchedness and

causes at least seven-tenths of the crimes and murders committed in the land.

Since having written the above, the awful lynching of a murderer, Sam Hose, took place in one of the southern states. When reading the account of it in the New York Journal I noticed an article written by Ingersoll on the subject, and again I found him announcing his theory that "Courage is liberty." He said: "One man draws his knife, and in a spirit of merry sport cuts off one of the ears of the victim. This he keeps as a trophy—souvenir. Another gentleman, fond of jest, cuts off the other ear. Another cuts off the nose of the chained and helpless wretch. The victim suffered in silence. He uttered no groan, no word—the one man of the two thousand who had courage." That man was a wilful murderer; he did not deny it, he frankly acknowledged it; so if Ingersoll's gospel that "Courage is liberty" be true, that wilful, unrepentant murderer (I say unrepentant because he said to the last that he did not regret having killed the man) was the only free man of the two thousand. What a gospel!

"Only those are traitors who resort to brute force?" There is not a particle of reason in such a statement. Nobody will attempt to deny that Judas Iscariot was the biggest traitor that ever lived. Neither will anybody attempt to affirm that he resorted to brute force. There have been traitors in times of war. Some of the most successful ones did not resort to brute force at all.

Men go into business together and it often turns out that one betrays the other and proves a traitor—by resorting to brute force? Not as a rule. Collect your senses and think of those whom you have known who have betrayed their kind friends—by resorting to brute force? No. Employees in stores and banks, etc., have often betrayed their employers and relieved them of a few hundred and

even thousands of dollars—by resorting to brute force? No, seldom.

In conclusion: There is not one of us but has been betrayed on a larger or smaller scale. Somebody has played treason and proved a traitor in affairs in the life of every one of us—by resorting to brute force? No.

I tell you if the only traitors we had to contend with were those who resorted to brute force this world would be a paradise in comparison to what it is.

That word, treason, tells the story of all that is wrong, of all iniquity, of every type and form and degree. That word, traitorship, tells the story of all the fault that can be found with this world to-day, or that could ever be found with it. Traitorship through "brute force"? No. Dispel from earth all treason planned and executed without brute force, and all brute force traitorship would be compelled to retire with it, and earth would be turned to heaven; because all brute force traitorship is only a physical, beastly execution of a traitorship previously planned and executed in the mind.

Don't imagine that "God gives us the holy torch light of reason, and then damns us for following that sacred light"? No, no, Mr. Ingersoll, play not the traitor, and you will frankly acknowledge that you know we never said nor thought such a thing. Men are damned because they don't follow that "sacred light." We get into trouble and condemnation for betraying that "sacred light." I tell you if we will but follow the admonition of Jesus Christ regarding that light we will have no cause to complain. It is this: "Take heed that the light which is in thee be not darkness." And here is what he says is sure to follow if we play the traitor with and refuse to follow that holy "torch-light." "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!"

The best and only reason ever yet given for men refusing to follow the light, is found in the Bible: "And this is the condemnation" ("dungeon of mind" if you please) "Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. For everyone that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest their deeds should be reproved."

CHAPTER IX.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLLIGENCE CONTINUED.

He Read Testament—Admits Need of Forgiveness Number Times, Denies it as Many—Can We Be Unjust to God?—He Says, "No Bankrupt [Court in Next World, Every Cent Must Be Paid"—The Injured Girl—Never Happy as Though Had Not Sinned?—His Gospel Incomplete.

Ingersoll says in his lecture, "A while ago I made up my mind to find out what was necessary for me to do in order to be saved."

"For thousands of years," he remarks, "the world had been asking that question:"

"What must we do to be saved?"

Then he asks, "Saved from poverty?" And he answers, "No." But the Bible and all creation answers, "Yes!" "Saved from crime?" and he answers, "No." But the Bible and humanity answers, "Yes!" "Saved from tyranny?" and he answers, "No." But the Bible and human nature answers, "Yes!" Then he answers what to be saved from: "From the eternal wrath of the God who made us all." How unreasonable! Let him come to Jesus and be saved and he will get somewhat rid

of that idea. He will see that we believe in being saved from crime and tyranny, that is to say, saved from our sins, and from the effects of the sins of all. He would see that we believe in being saved for time as well as eternity; saved to make the world better and alleviate human suffering of body and mind. Saved, not only for eternal felicity in the great beyond but for a much happier life here.

He says that he read the gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John and found that the church had been deceiving him, that they did not understand their own book. I wonder who has deceived him the most, the church or Robert Ingersoll! We have already seen some of his understanding of the book; but we will see more of it yet.

He quotes the promises:

"For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if you forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Then he says: "I accept the condition. There is an offer, I accept it. If you will forgive men that trespass against you, God will forgive your trespasses against him. I accept the terms, and I never will ask any God to treat me better than I treat my fellowmen."

And now we come to a point where I hardly know what to say. He has shown his colors here so distinctly, that I must confess I hardly know how to express myself.

Here we find him, acknowledging himself a sinner before God and accepting these conditions of forgiveness, while back on page 13 of his lecture, we find him declaring that "we cannot injure God."

If we cannot do God an injustice what have we to do with God anyway? If we cannot be unjust to God, why or how can we need any condition of forgiveness? And yet he strongly affirms that he accepts these terms on which God is to forgive him. This, then, is a plain

statement that he believes in his sins against God and that he believes it necessary to implore the forgiveness of God, and that he believes the Bible is a message from God, or he could not accept the offer. Then I turn to page 84, in the chapter where he tells what he proposes, and I read, "I do not believe in forgiveness as it is preached by the church. We do not need the forgiveness of God." Then I turn back to page 81 of the same chapter, and I read, "I do not destroy the promise; if you will forgive others God will forgive you." Then back again to page 85, and I read there, "No forgiveness by the gods." You see if he comes to a point where by saying that he believes in a certain thing that will help him to carry his argument he says he believes it. Then when he comes to a point where he must deny the same thing in order to get through his argument he really denies or rejects the idea which he has just been falling in with. "Anything for argument just at the moment I am arguing that point," appears to be his plan. He says also, "If there is another world, there is no bankrupt court there; every cent must be paid." To illustrate he says: "If I by slander, cover some poor girl with the leprosy of some imputed crime, and she withers away like a blighted flower and afterward I get the forgiveness of God, how does that help her? We have got to settle with the people we have wronged here." That's no new idea. That is both law and gospel. But what I want to make doubly impressive upon your mind just now is that he says, "You must reap the results of your acts. Every cent must be paid."

Think, now, of the injury done this poor girl just mentioned!! Think of her condition, her suffering of body and mind by "withering away like a blighted flower" under that "imputed crime." The weight of this injury cannot be estimated; but that makes no difference,

"Every cent must be paid" he tells us. I would like to know how he is going to work to pay that enormous debt. So enormous is it that it cannot be estimated in weights or measures; still "Every cent must be paid," and yet he has nothing to pay it with. (Here you see he acknowledges the necessity of a mediator—like our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ—whom he rejects, and vehemently denies and says he does not want.) And so he is getting a burden upon his shoulders that must remain there, if his gospel be true, for time and for eternity. He says, "For every crime you commit you must answer to yourself and to the one you injure." As far as possible, yes, Brother Ingersoll we subscribe to that. But he says, "If you have ever clothed another with woe, as with a garment of pain you will never be quite as happy as though you had not done that thing." What a predicament to be in! We must pay the debt and suffer for it too. What a gospel to contrive! We "must pay every cent" and then not get a receipt. He has manufactured a worse gospel than he makes out the old one to be.

They say to him, "What do you propose" after tearing down what you do? And he answers, "I have not torn the good down. I have only endeavored to trample out the ignorant, cruel fires of hell." What? Why, "Every cent must be paid," and we cannot have a receipt then. What a cruel gospel! And, he says, "Even when forgiven by the one you have injured it is not as though the injury had not been done. Never can be quite as happy as though we had not sinned." That is anything but a complete gospel. It is not fitted to the needs of the human race. That is a more cruel God (if a God it may be called than he makes out the God of our gospel to be) for he is so cruel and merciless as to leave all in an imperfect state of happiness, however much we

may desire and strive for a full restoration. He is not even merciful enough to give the fallen race an opportunity to return to the lost estate.

But our "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him need not perish, but have everlasting life." Ah! Ingersoll's gospel is weighed in the balances and found wanting!

Now in the case of this poor girl that he has spoken of: let us suppose that she accepts the gospel; but he clings to his own. He beholds her "covered with the leprosy of his imputed crime." He sees her angrily tossed on the seething billows of the ocean of sorrow into which he has flung her! He sees this fair maid, whose prospects for this world were bright, swallowed up by the cruel waves of his "imputed crime." He sees her "wither away like a blighted flower." Can he pay the debt? No, never. His gospel says, "Every cent must be paid," but it can't be and he knows it.

This poor girl accepts the gospel. She forgives those that trespass against her. Her own sins she takes to God, and God for Christ's sake pardons all and gives her the witness of His Spirit that all is well and she has a rest, a peace that passeth understanding. And all the great debt that she cannot pay is brought to Christ and he has paid it all, and her deep-seated peace and rest of soul and the witness of the spirit is the receipt which she receives to the effect that the debt is paid and so she is certain of full and perfect restoration to her lost estate there to be as happy as though sin had never marred her being. But Mr. Ingersoll clings to his own gospel, and this let us suppose, is the only sin of which he is guilty, the only thing that stands between him and perfect restoration. Let us suppose that he pays every cent, (of course it would be impossible though.) He is really and awfully sorry for

what he has done. He gets her forgiveness and does all in his power to have that black mark removed from his soul but his efforts are fruitless. According to his own gospel his garments are stained, and those stains can never be removed. According to his own gospel his happiness is interferred with for time and for eternity. This falls far short of being an intelligent gospel.

But this partial restoration of the sinner in his gospel of proposals seems to be only for those who strive for restoration ; and if they can be but partially restored, "where must the ungodly and sinner appear ?" What of those who do not forgive others, who have no regard for what is right, but appear as though they wanted to do all the evil they could and live and die without repentance ?

The hell fire which Ingersoll's gospel creates is a thousand times more ignorant and cruel than what he claims of the one he endeavors to trample out.

Let us now consult, according to Ingersoll's advice, conscience, reason, education, logic, philosophy and science. Let all these full-grown and well developed children of intelligence speak, and judge between the two gospels. There certainly can be no divided jury in this case. Every one of them are agreed that our gospel is by far the more attractive, the more to be desired and the more scientific, reasonable and common-sense gospel of the two. (I will convince you of it in a chapter on that subject.)

Mr. Ingersoll is in somewhat the same predicament with his gospel that the United States government was in its early day, with its first articles of confederation which were not appropriate to the needs of the nation. They furnished to the government only the power to propose what should be done. Congress was given power to borrow money but not to pay it, power to declare war but not to

raise taxes to furnish money with which to carry on that war. And so it is with Ingersoll's gospel. It tells us that every cent of the great debt of our sins must be paid, but it provides no means whereby it can be paid. But our God, seeing man with that awful burden of the great debt of his sins upon him, unable to pay the debt, provided a way whereby it should be paid, and a receipt given to all who would comply with the simple conditions. Yes, our gospel enables those who will to rise triumphant to the full possession of the heavenly estate.

CHAPTER X.

ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF INTELLIGENCE CONCLUDED.

Heaven or Hell Our Own Choice—Ingersoll Despises Humility and the Atonement of Christ—"Every Cent Must Be Paid" But No Way to Pay It—Heaven Where Those Are We Love?—Some Saved; Others Lost.

He says, "No God can put a man in hell in another world who has made a little heaven in this." If we go to hell we will go there because we loved darkness rather than light and because we deliberately chose darkness to light, not because God wants us there; but in keeping with Ingersoll's own "Eternal, inexorable, everlasting justice, so far as nature is concerned, that we must reap what we sow." In the final judgment it will not be necessary to tell us whether to take the right hand or depart to the left; neither will any accuse their fellow-men or their maker of judging them unkindly or unjustly.

He tells us that "No God can put a man in hell in another world, who has made a little heaven in this;" but nowhere in his chapter of proposals does he tell us what he proposes to do with the man who has made a little

hell in this world; and he says he has made up his mind "If there is a God He will be merciful to the merciful and will not torture the forgiving. Upon that rock he stands. That "The honest man, the good woman have nothing to fear, either in this world or the world to come." Upon that rock he stands. But he does not tell us what he proposes to do with the unmerciful and unforgiving, the dishonest man and the bad woman, for lots of them there are in this world, (perhaps he has not made up his mind yet unless the "eternal sleep," annihilation, of which he speaks is intended for the unsaved; or perhaps to lightly dismiss the subject and get rid of telling us what he proposes for them, he says, "I will leave my dead where Nature leaves them.") But hark! Listen! Hear his confident declaration of Nature's proposals: "You must reap what you sow. Every cent must be paid. No bankrupt court there." But really he has well said, "No bankrupt court there," for Nature—God—seeing man bankrupt, with a debt upon him he could not pay, in mercy constructed a bank, so to speak, in Jesus Christ our Lord, that furnishes an exhaustless supply from which we may draw if we wish; but Ingersoll's gospel seeks to demolish that supply and leave us helpless.

He says he does not want the atonement of Christ, that he does "not want to be a charity angel," and that he has "no ambition to become a winged pauper of the skies;" and he curses the God who would give His innocent Son for guilty men.

It is the very simplicity of the gospel at which he stumbles. He hates, he despises the thought of humility. He is above anything of the kind. With what vehement ardor does he tell us of his hostility to a mind so meek and lowly as to accept Christ as a mediator! With what rancorous enmity does he trample upon the idea of humbling

himself to say, "O God, for Christ's sake, forgive my sins!" He looks down upon us because we accept the atonement. From his exalted position he maligns the Christian church, because we "kneel," as he says "to a God who accepts the agony of the innocent for an atonement for the guilty." Yet his gospel sees us down —in hell as it were—with a burden of the debt of our sins upon us a myriad of times greater than we can ever lift, and it says to us, "You have got to reap what you have sowed. Every cent must be paid, and you can't get up from there until you have paid every cent." I wonder what kind of a God he calls that! Is it not worse than he has made out of what he calls the Orthodox God? He says of endless punishment, "I despise it, and I defy it." And yet he is creating as bad a hell as the one he proposes to destroy.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." I should advise him to send forth his angels into the four quarters of the earth and gather together his sayings and hustle them into his machine shop and work them over again (or destroy them and give it up as a bad job) and hold a council of war—Oh! excuse me, Peace Commission. But if they get these sayings of his together so they will stay I think he will have to get his drilling machine into active work. I imagine it will be necessary to use lots of glue and a good many rivets.

These sayings of his remind me of electricities. Some attract each other; others repel. Bring the North pole of one magnet to the South pole of another and there is an attraction, a drawing, a clinging together; but bring the north pole of one magnet to the north pole of another magnet and there is war in camp, a repulsion, they do not like each other. And so Mr. Ingersoll makes a negative statement and then an affirmative, or vice-versa, upon the

same subject and tries to weld them together. It would be just as sensible to try to weld a stick of wood to a piece of iron.

"Talk," he says, "about the consolations of this infamous doctrine, that makes a father say, 'I can be happy with my daughter in hell,' that makes a mother say, 'I can be happy with my generous, brave boy in hell,' that makes a boy say, 'I can enjoy the glory of heaven with the woman who bore me, the woman who would have died for me, in eternal agony,'" and he adds, "They call that tidings of great joy." He also says, "Heaven is where those are we love, and those who love us." Let us investigate:

Here is a man and wife, well mated, jubilant and happy; but suddenly all is changed. This kind and loving husband takes to drinking. He becomes a poor, miserable sot, corrupted and degraded. His kind and loving and gentle words are seldom heard any more; but they have turned to words of unkindness, profanity, hatred and contempt. His gentle loving treatment is seldom realized any more; but is turned to abuse, it has become hateful, brutal, fiendish. Her comfortable support has turned to a cold house, short rations and little clothing. But she has been true to her marriage vows—more than true to them. She has treated him kindly all the while. She loves him still. She bemoans his condition! She weeps over him by day and by night! The trouble and sorrow he has caused her no tongue can tell! And yet Mr. Ingersoll tells us she is living in heaven all this time. This man loves his wife and they are still living together. Drunkards love their wives. Thieves and murderers love their wives. Now Mr. Ingersoll, I am going to strike you with your own weapon:

"Talk about the consolation of this infamous doctrine." The consolation of a doctrine that makes a father and husband say, "I am in heaven, but a wretched, drunken sot. I am happy though spending time and money in drunken rows and fights while the woman and children that I love are at home half clothed, and shivering with cold. I am happy in my home with my loved ones whom I thrash and pound and treat so cruelly while they are so kind to me." That makes a wife and mother say, "I am living in heaven with my son, the boy that I bore and for whom I would die, leading a wild and reckless life, in drunken rows and even murders, bringing shame and disgrace upon himself and others. I am living in heaven, with the man I love leaving me and the dear children at home, in coldness and hunger, while he spends our substance in riotous living, in gambling hells and drinking saloons, in debauchery and crime. I am in heaven with the man I love pounding and cruelly treating the woman and children who are the idols of his heart." And then he asks us to believe that an intelligent gospel. That is worse than he makes out of the creed he calls "frightful, hideous and hellish." *(I am pleased, however, that this noted agnostic should name such a gospel after himself.)*

It is true that we may have a large degree of happiness, a sweet rest of soul, a grand foretaste of heaven here; yet trouble comes to the best of homes, and when you come to call it heaven I tell you I believe in a whole-hearted heaven. It matters not how good the home in this life, pain and sorrow enters there more or less. I tell you Mr. Ingersoll it would be a crime for us not to believe in a higher heaven than anything you have told us about yet.

"Talk about the consolation of a doctrine" that says to countless numbers of people, "Visit those loved ones in yonder asylum or hospital and see them rave in delirium or droop in the darkness of gloom and despair the misery of which no tongue can tell, or see them languishing on beds of sickness and suffering, or undergoing a severe operation, and clap your hands for joy because you are in heaven!"—With those you love. And this is the doctrine of heaven that we must accept at present or be called all sorts of naughty names. *We have got to believe this doctrine without understanding it too?*

The inhabitants of what you call the "Orthodox heaven" will not suffer from the blighting curse of sin. Sorrowing and weeping will not enter there. Our gospel will not remember the past against us forever, the way yours does. The whole will be blotted out forever, through Jesus Christ our Savior. There is nothing unreasonable about believing in a whole-hearted gospel.

Now to his "infamous doctrine" as he calls it of God and human beings being happy in heaven while others are in hell. If that idea is correct then God is unhappy now, knowing as He does, all the suffering of humanity from the slightest degree perceptible to the human intellect, to the most intense suffering possible for man to endure, with all the damning, blackening crimes and vices and degradations that humanity is subject to on earth; and neither could anybody enjoy themselves here, for everybody loves somebody who is wayward and unruly, suffering from the blighting curses of sin of some description. There is no sense in the idea of God clothing himself in crape and making a business of mourning over the trouble that we bring upon ourselves. People often become so attached to loved ones that they mourn and grieve over them, when afflicted, so that it really makes them sick; but of course

it must be heaven never-the-less, if Ingersoll says so, if the atmosphere they breathe is tainted with sorrow and disease. I repeat that it is a crime to preach no higher heaven than Ingersoll does.

Let us see now, about his statement, "I never will ask any God to treat me better than I treat my fellow-men." I wonder if he would be willing to stand by that to the last. I wonder if he has not won many cases in law-suits that were in the wrong, and by so doing done injustice to the party in the right. I wonder if he will stand by his own gospel and "pay every cent" to those whom his arguments have beaten in Court, when justice demanded that they should win. I wonder if he could do it even though he felt so disposed?

CHAPTER XI.

REVISED VERSION OF INGERSOLL'S CHAPTER ON "THE METHODISTS."

Great Opinion of Self—His Calling—Unlike Wesley—Rescuing the Deity—Infidels Their Own Enemies.

In the neighborhood of sixty-five years ago there appeared on the face of the earth a man by the name of Robert Ingersoll—he has been nicknamed Bob. He has the greatest opinion of himself of any man I ever heard of. He will get off the sheerest nonsense and call it common-sense. It is "My gospel, my gospel, my gospel; my doctrine, my doctrine; I tell you, I tell you; I say." Self is the central figure around which the world should revolve. He does not need the forgiveness of God; but he does need the forgiveness of himself. The love he recommends for the human race, is "self-love,"—"intelligent self-love." If he cannot go to heaven on the merits of Bob. Ingersoll he does not want to go there; and he would rather go to hell than descend into the valley of humiliation, than accept of the atonement of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

He took up the study of the Bible, of christian writings, of ecclesiastical and profane history. He found that all but a few sentences of the Bible were false, and that the Bible and Christianity was a most prolific source of the agonies and crimes of the world, of darkness and gloom in the human heart and of the bacteriological hell of ignorance in which the world was floundering.

He was a lawyer and a law came into existence, through him as a mediator, that "Science was the only possible savior of the human race." He said, "if the world is in such a hell of ignorance somebody ought to mention it." The spirit of God, common-sense and conscience said, give your heart to God and make a useful man of yourself. Ingersoll said, "This frightful truth ought to be proclaimed from the house-top of every opportunity, from the highway of every occasion." He said, if there is such a hell "and a Niagara of souls pouring over an eternal precipice of ignorance, somebody ought to say something." And he was right, if the Bible and Christianity is such a heinous thing it should be destroyed, root and branch.

Unlike Wesley, he is not a believer in the Bible; he believes in Robert Ingersoll. Unlike Wesley he does not believe "in the actual presence of the Almighty;" he believes in the wonderful presence of Robert Ingersoll. Unlike Wesley, he does not have God perform for him, so inferior wonders as curing his headaches, his horse's lameness, or putting off showers for his meetings; he is above it; but God put off giving to the world the "infinitely important fact" that "Science is the only possible savior of the human race," for nearly six thousand years, to give Mr. Ingersoll a chance to gain the honor of being the inspired instrument of God, and the "only mediator between God and man."

Unlike Wesley, he does not believe "in the actual existence of the devil;" but he believes in the great existence of Robert Ingersoll. Unlike Wesley, he does not believe that "devils have possession of people;" he believes that Robert Ingersoll can get possession of them, although I think I would have little choice as to which I would be possessed with, Ingersoll or the devil, if there is any difference. There is this much about it, however, one may be possessed with the devil without being possessed with Ingersoll; vice-versa? "Nay verily," I do not believe one can be possessed with Ingersoll without being possessed with the devil. Unlike Wesley, Ingersoll did not talk to the devil when he was in people, for the devil to tell him he was going to leave and go into another person, and be there when he got there, "prompt to the minute;" but Ingersoll talked to Ingersoll and told him that he himself could get into people, and that he would be there at about such a time, and being so mighty a personage, he just takes it for granted that he is there, "prompt to the minute." But he is mistaken. He may be honest in what he says, "but I don't believe it."

Every person that he gets into, or in other words, every person that becomes possessed with Ingersoll, he counts as a victory for Bob, and as evidence of the intelligence of that individual.

Mr. Ingersoll has delivered a lecture entitled "What Must We Do to be Saved," in which he takes the ground that faith is a poisonous parasite and that no particular belief is necessary; and yet he clearly proves that a particular belief in a certain thing is an absolute necessity. (See chapter 4.) He will allow us to believe what we please but we can never "believe right" until we believe in Bob Ingersoll.

In that lecture Ingersoll has given us two accounts of the relation which we hold to God. In the first account he "takes the ground" that we cannot injure God; and that we cannot benefit or help him. In the second account he "takes the ground" that the *church* has *shamefully abused* and *injured* God. And after investigating matters and finding the Almighty in so terrible a condition, heart-broken, courage gone, good name destroyed, and reputation blasted, knowing of course that God was unable to take care of his own name and reputation, he decided to have pity on the Almighty, and "the only way to stop" the downward course of the great name of Almighty God was for Mr. Ingersoll to hasten to the rescue! Here are his own words for it: "From the aspersions of the pulpit I seek to rescue the reputation of the Deity." Poor Deity! Downtrodden Deity! Mighty Ingersoll! Greater—"I am"—Ingersoll! Deity rescuing Ingersoll! What a fortunate thing for the Almighty that Mr. Ingersoll would condescend to lift him up! "In order to believe right" it is necessary to believe this. "What a blessing that we do not have to understand it!"

Ingersoll and infidelity, unlike Wesley and Whitefield, did not fall out on the question of predestination, but they fell out on the question of the importance of the Bible in the world, and as to whether God or woman should be the object of our supreme adoration. (France has led the world in infidelity for many years. See chapter on France.) Infidelity undertook to legislate the Bible and Christianity out of existence, and they set up their "Goddess of reason," represented by a theatre dancing girl (a dissolute female) as the great object worthy of the world's highest esteem; but seeing the hazardous effects, it revoked its own laws against the Bible and the worship of God and thus said that the world was desparately in

need of the Bible and Christianity, and that God, not woman, should be most highly exalted. But Ingersoll says that the Bible must be given up and that woman, instead of God, has the first claim upon man. Infidelity said, "My little Robert, we have had experience, the Bible must be given to the world and God should be placed above all else." But Ingersoll said, "No, give us self-love, for intelligent self-love embraces within its mighty arms all the human race. Give us love for woman, we cannot afford to spend any on God." But infidelity answered, "We speak that we do know and testify that we have seen. While we do not care for God or the Bible ourselves we have found that the world needs both and that the more you can get of the Bible and of God into the heart of man the better men will love their wives and the more they will love humanity in general." But still Mr. Ingersoll is obstinate and will not learn the lesson. So you see the doctrine that infidelity "founded is still active."

He says of the Methodists, "Probably no church in the world has done so much preaching for as little money as the Methodists;" but we are obliged to reverse the matter in his case and declare that probably no man in the world ever got so much money for as little preaching as Mr. Ingersoll. And it sounds well for him to tell us how "Through all the years those who plowed divided with those who prayed." How "Wicked industry supported pious idleness; the hut gave to the cathedral and frightened poverty gave even its rags to buy a robe for hypocrisy," and hold himself up as a model of common-sense and honesty and tell us how anxiously he will labor and do all he can to rid man of foolish superstitions and drive the infinite shadow of hell out of his heart, when he would not condescend to make one single delivery of

this lecture, "What Must We Do to be Saved?" without a previous guarantee of at least one hundred dollars.

"In old times" infidelity was silly and profligate. In their places of worship was their Goddess of reason, a dissolute female, "to take the place of the Deity." They even abrogated the marriage fealty, a man or woman would live with one companion a while and then take another, and divorces were much more frequent than births—tremendously "barbarous," heathenish and hellish. "They have advanced since then," they have returned to better ideas of marriage, and Ingersoll calls for "good women;" but "we" still "find as a fact, demonstrated by" the intelligence of Bob. Ingersoll, that woman, in the heart of man, should be placed above the Almighty.

"There is another thing" that infidels "should remember, and that is that the" infidels "have been the greatest enemies they ever had." They start out to prove the Bible false but by investigating, many of them become converted. Their own arguments really prove the truth of the Bible, and they should remember that faith, not unbelief, is the cause of all goodness, truth and morality.

"There is one thing about" infidelity "that I like," it manifests its true nature in the hearts of those who embrace it so that they are always troubled with the question, that an infidel out in the field, walking back and forth, and swinging his hands, was heard asking himself over and over and over again, "Is there a God or ain't there a God!? Is there a God or ain't there a God!? Is there a God or ain't there a God!?" "I find," also that infidels "differ in their creeds" about as much as the churches do.

Ingersoll says "The Methodist church is adapted to new countries." Infidelity is adapted to the hearts of peo-

ple who do not wish for religious and moral restraint; "its ministers" are those who will not acknowledge that they are taking an exactly opposite course from that which they know and deeply feel they ought to take, "and with them" calling themselves unbelievers, for an excuse for their ways, takes the place of truth. A good many of their converts are profligate Spiritualists; but aside from them, according to their number of converts a much larger per cent. of them backslide, than there does of those who are converted to Jesus Christ. "In the" awful struggles "that follow" in the deep recesses of the soul, "most of the converts" shrink from the horrifying thoughts of infidelity, to find mercy and peace through Jesus Christ. No person was ever sorry for embracing Christianity. It does not make people miserable; but gives them solid comfort. It causes one to die in peace. But infidelity works directly opposite, not only in the dying moments, but during life.

Talmage, a few years ago preached a sermon declaring how infidelity troubles, horrifies, breaks to pieces, tears down and destroys; and how Christianity brings peace, drives horror away, builds up and preserves; after which Ingersoll revised this lecture, and told about his gospel and what wonders it would perform.

CHAPTER XII.

SLIGHT ANALYSIS OF INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF HUMOR.

Wine, Tobacco, Hay—A Mistake That Solemn People Are Always Stupid and That no Humorous Person Ever Founded a Religion—Humor no Tendency to Make People What They Should Be—Despondency of Great Humorists—Something Lacking in Soul Regardless of Humor — God's Mistakes — Enemies — Ingersoll Divided Against Himself—Unconsciously Reveals Belief in Prophets.

Name something else that Ingersoll proposes? "Good fellowship, good friends" all round, funny people, etc. Then he goes on with the following: "One man said to another:"

"'Will you take a glass of wine?'"

"'I do not drink.'"

"'Will you smoke a cigar?'"

"'I do not smoke.'"

"'May be you will chew something!'"

"'I do not chew.'"

"'Let us eat some hay.'"

"'I tell you I do not eat hay.'"

"'Well, then, good-bye, for you are no company for man or beast.'"

Then he adds, "I believe in the gospel of cheerfulness, of Good Nature, of good health."

What a noble idea! Drink wine, smoke cigars and chew tobacco to make us cheerful, good natured and healthy; the very things that bring their opposites.

He does not like solemnity. He wants to see people jolly and full of fun. "While reason," he says, "is the holy light, humor carries the lantern, and the man with a keen sense of humor is preserved from the solemn stupidities of superstition."

He makes one statement contradict another right through. He says solemn people are always stupid people; but that is not true, some of our greatest men have been men of solemnity. Jesus Christ, he frankly admits, was one of the world's greatest men, anything but a stupid man, and yet history records not one single statement that he ever made to provoke laughter, or that could be called humorous. Again, "No man of any humor ever founded a religion—never." But is it true? No. Ingersoll is a humorous man, and we have but to take him at his word and say that he has founded a religion, too, he has preached enough anyhow, and he is all, "My gospel, my gospel," and he calls himself a humorous man and then says "No man of any humor ever founded a religion—never." Well, well, how can we believe his many conflicting stories unless we believe what we know is not so?

But some of our best religious workers in the church are mirthful, witty people. I like to see people with a well developed faculty of mirthfulness, I like to meet them; but I like to see them use it aright and not make boors of themselves to distort the truth.

Mirthfulness, according to science, and that's what he calls for, does not make men merciful or forgiving. It

L of C.

does not make his "honest man" nor his "good woman." I notice too, that humorous people are subject to bad spells as well as other people. They have their ups and downs more than those who are not so mirthful. They are subject to the blues as much as anybody. A larger per cent. of funny, witty people fall into utter despair and commit suicide than of those who are apparently more solemn. One has well expressed it, "The funny man of to-day is the despondent man of to-morrow." People of large humor are often, in society or company of others, largely manifesting apparent jollity and glee when their heart is heavier than lead. They often appear to treat very lightly and sportively upon a subject when within they are laboring under painful and solemn convictions. (Do you see what I mean now by saying I do not like to see the faculty used dishonestly?) A humorous person with little regard for the truth will often get up a laugh and thwart the logical and irrefutable arguments of a conscientious intelligent man.

One of the greatest humorists ever known, Matthew Matthews, used to give humorous lectures to large city audiences and keep his audience in an uproar. One day after giving one of these lectures he went to a physician—who did not know him—and told him how he was troubled with the blues and wanted to know if he couldn't do something for him, and so the doctor advised him to go and hear Matthew Matthews lecture. "Alas!" said the man, "I am Matthew Matthews myself!"

A young man—a bright intelligent young man—with whom I am acquainted, was always exceedingly witty and humorous; but when he was solemn he was solemn. With his own mouth did he reveal to me the fact that he thought earnestly upon religious subjects. But unfortunately that was not the worst of it. He met

with a sore disappointment. His humor save him? No. He was furiously tossed on the tempestuous tides of despondency! He wreaked and he writhed in the agonies of despair! For some time he contemplated suicide! There was a bridge across which he used to have to go. Evening after evening he would stop and think to perform the awful tragedy! A thirty-two calibre revolver would be drawn from his pocket and pointed at his head.

Another naturally exceedingly witty and humorous young man, whom I knew, bright and intelligent, an able scholar and well liked, succumbed to despair and actually took his own life.

No, no, large mirthfulness is not salvation. Those who are without salvation, and yet are quite humorous, and feel free to speak, acknowledge that there is a sort of aching void within them, reaching out after something, they can scarcely tell what; but a lack which even the keen sense of humor cannot supply. To be sure it does afford a certain amount of enjoyment, of light of its kind; but it is small when placed along by the side of salvation, and it is quite different—you, dear reader, will not be able to comprehend this unless you have experienced it—but when you come to compare humor with salvation, truly it is like comparing a tallow candle with the sun. What the world calls fun and pleasure often brings relief, for the time being, but it does not cure.

Perhaps this would be the most appropriate time to tell you that Mr. Ingersoll wants to know why God should make mistakes. And "Infinite Wisdom never made a poor investment," he says. But it would really seem, from our finite minds, as though He made a gross mistake, a poor investment indeed, when he made Bob Ingersoll. Then he says, "Why should he not correct his mistakes instead of damning them?" Well, well, if

this mistake—Mr. Ingersoll—is damned instead of corrected who can be blamed? Nobody but himself. He won't come to the judgment and go to shooting off his mouth to God and giving God his lip, the way he says on page 53 of his lecture that he will. He will be like one of old who had not on the wedding garment—speechless:"

"The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son." Wedding garments (an outer garment—such was the custom in that country at that time) were furnished at the door for every guest, and there came along a man who, like Mr. Ingersoll, wished to be called a teacher, not a preacher, and so made up his mind to teach them how to go to a wedding and wear no garment but his own. "When the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding-garment: And he saith unto him, 'Friend,' see how kindly he approaches him, 'Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And,"—he gave the king hail-columbia? No. "And"—he said "I thought I would wear no garments but my own?" No. What then? "And he was speechless." Why shouldn't he be? He knew his duty but felt above it.

Mr. Ingersoll says that "It will not do for this God who tells us to love our enemies, to damn his:"

Now let us consult his own gospel and see if it is God that damns the sinner. I turn to page 84, and I read, "I believe in that gospel of Justice, that we must reap what we sow. Every cent must be paid." Then to page 86 and I read, "Give us intelligence. In a little while a man will find that he cannot murder without assassinating his own joy. He will find that every crime is a mistake." So if what he says here is true—and it certainly is—men rob themselves, God does not; they bring damnation upon

themselves, God does not; they sow what they please, and as a reasonable consequence of nature and justice, they will reap and God is not to be held responsible. That, understand, is Ingersoll's doctrine—when it will help carry the point he argues; but he freely contradicts it when arguing in another direction; and it is also law and gospel, and it seems to be in keeping with what we have already alluded to, namely: that when judgment is passed upon us we will of necessity be speechless, without one word of fault to find.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." Mr. Ingersoll is divided against himself. His gospel phrases collide and there is a crash, they explode each other. His doctrines hold together like feathery down in a Chateaugay thaw. His sayings fit each other about as a bran sack fits a bean pole, and will leak out of common-sense faster than hot syrup out of cheese cloth.

But "Why should not God correct his mistakes instead of damning them?" He should. God made man and gave him the power of choosing his own course, and he chose the destructive one. "The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented God that he had made man in the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." He destroyed the world, perserving a family which was all right at the time and started anew. But it seemed to be the same old story. God had told man what the result of sin would be; but against all warnings and remonstrances he wilfully chose death. He saw the peril to which man was doomed; mercy spoke and "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son" so that man may be restored to his lost estate if he will. Do you see anything

in this? Ingersoll recommends that "God correct his mistakes instead of damning them;" God executes the proposal and then Mr. Ingersoll would verily damn him for carrying out his own suggestion. Yes, such a God would be a thousand times worse "monster of monsters," than his so-called Orthodox God!

Ingersoll is about as good at throwing criticisms as most women are at throwing stones. A surgeon was sewing up a gash in a man's face, and asked him, of course, how he got that wound, to which the man replied,—"My—my wife gave it to me by throwing a stone." "Well, well," remarked the surgeon in astonishment, "I never before knew a woman to hit anything she threw at." "Why," said the man, "She was throwing at the neighbors' hens, I was off back of her."

The humbuggery of Ingersoll's gospel, when viewed through the magnifying glass of common-sense, is as readily detected as a humbug I read about a while ago. Some college students procured a number of different bugs and insects, took the body of one, the head of another, the legs of another, the tail of another, and the wings of another, etc., and glued them together and took their peculiar creature to their professor and asked him if he could tell them what kind of a bug that was. He threw his sharp eyes upon it and immediately replied—"A humbug."

But talk about getting so much intelligence out of this gospel of Ingersoll's! It would be just as sensible to talk of getting milk out of a turkey. Reason indeed! I think by reading his reasoning that he got an idiot to reason for him, for it certainly seems hard to accuse a sensible man of such unsensible reasoning—or else, as he once said of another man, "He stood on his head and reasoned with his feet." Honestly I begin to pity the

poor fellow to think he has allowed such reasoning to come before the public as the product of his intellect.

Think of an infidel manufacturing a gospel for humanity! That is too much like making pea soup without a pea to make it of.

One Samson of old slew a thousand men with the jaw bone of an ass. Mr. Ingersoll is now wielding the same weapon against Christianity—he might as well try to shoot the man in the moon with a pop gun. Here endeth our chapter on Ingersoll's gospel of Humor.

CHAPTER XIII.

INGERSOLL PUZZLED—MYSTERY EXPLAINED.

Christ Did Not Write a Word, Nor Command Others to Write or Preserve His Saying, Nor Sign the Writings Himself; Christ Could Not Have Done a Sillier Thing, for He is That Word—No Command to Preserve Word But Divine Information That it Would Be Preserved—Ingersoll's Reason for Christ's Writing Nothing, Reply Thereto.

There is another thing that he can't get over, a puzzling affair indeed to his great intellect, and that is that Christ did not write any of the New Testament, nor tell anybody else to write anything or even to preserve his sayings. I will give you his exact words:

"You must remember also one other thing. Christ never wrote a solitary word of the New Testament—not one word. There is an account that he once stooped and wrote something in the sand, but that has not been preserved. He never told anybody to write a word. He never said: 'Matthew, remember this, Mark, do not forget to put that down. Luke, be sure that in your gospel you have this. John, do not forget it.' Not one word.

And it has always seemed to me that a being coming from another world, with a message of infinite importance to mankind, should at least have verified that message by his own signature. Is it not wonderful that not one word was written by Christ? Is it not strange that he gave no orders to have his words preserved—words upon which hung the salvation of a world?"

Well, well, that will do for a baby mind and these deluded scientific reasoners, but certainly not for a man who is not betraying that "holy torch-light" of reason. Let us see what we can do to help self-conceited intelligence out of such a dilemma.

But I want you to notice first how much importance he attaches to that statement. How much force he seems to think there is in that argument! It seems as though he tried doubly hard, and threw all the power that he could muster into that saying, for he repeats it over and over, only in a little different way, to make sure of getting the mind of the reader onto that idea. It appears as though he thought there was enough, right in that argument alone, if he can just get us to consider it, to overthrow the whole system of Christianity. But he is laboring as usual, under a self-inflicted hallucination.

Jesus Christ, having come to earth as he did, to carry out his own plans, in fulfilment of His own Word, to verify his promises to the world, and to fulfil the prophecies of his own people, could not have done a sillier thing than to have written these sayings of his himself, and then signed his name to them. In the first place Jesus Christ (in the person of God the father) wrote the law, upon the tables of stone. The God of the Old Testament is the Christ of the New; and the Christ of the New Testament is the God of the Old. God sent Moses to deliver his people from Egypt and said, "Tell them I Am has

sent you." In the New Testament Christ tells us that he is the same "I Am" who sent Moses into Egypt. He said "Before Abraham was I Am." Hence is explained the meaning of what would be otherwise a dark saying.

The law He wrote himself, and he caused to be written the prophecies and the things concerning himself. Many of the things of the Old Testament were written by direct commandment. The book of Revelation contains the gospel of Christ and a great deal of prophecy, and that was written by direct commandment. And if God had sent his message at different times to earth, written out, signed, God Almighty, they would not have been worth the paper on which they were written. Not a word would have been believed. It would have been laughed to scorn. If Jesus Christ had written, with his own hand, his own sayings, closing with his signature, Jesus Christ, it would not have been worth the ink that it took to write it. It would never have spread.

God has put a faculty within man which conveys to him the power of communicating with his Maker, and what an idea it would be for him to be sending his written messages with his name signed! A sillier thing, who could think of! As the Almighty God conveyed His word to a few Prophets, chosen for the purpose, why should he have been cautioning them that they be sure to preserve his word and move it along? God spake with authority and He just said, "*It shall be done.*" "Not by might nor by power; but by my spirit, saith the Lord." And again by the mouth of Isaiah He has said: "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow and watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it *shall* prosper in the thing

whereto I sent it." These things have been verified down through the ages. The word has proved true. Nothing has been able to overthrow or successfully combat that word of God.

But what Ingersoll wants to know is, why God—Jesus Christ—while here in the body, did not write, nor command the apostles to write, nor caution them to preserve his words. "Is it not wonderful," says he, apparently puzzled, "that not one word was written by Christ?" *Jesus Christ spake with authority. He said it shall be done.* He said, "Not one jot or title of the word shall in any wise fail till all be fulfilled. Though heaven and earth pass away *My words"—said He with authority which belonged to the Deity alone—"My words shall not pass away.* "This gospel of the kingdom," Christ declared, "shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."

So now let us allow him all there is in his argument that Christ left no orders to have his words preserved; and *he* will have to allow that Christ left *divine information* to the effect that they *would be preserved.* He will also have to allow that they have been preserved.

Then he goes on to tell us "Why nothing was written." In his judgment he says, "They expected the end of the world in a few days. 'That generation was not to pass away until the heavens should be rolled up as a scroll, and until the earth should melt with fervent heat:'"

That idea he gets from what Christ said should be signs of his second coming. The moon should be turned into blood, the sun darkened, and the stars should fall from heaven as figs from its tree when shaken by a mighty wind. Then comes the declaration of Christ that "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." And Ingersoll shows his ignorance when he gives

us to understand that he understands "This generation" to mean the generation to which Christ was speaking. The generation which should not pass until Christ came to earth again was the generation that should be living and witness the fulfilment of that prophecy concerning the sun, moon and stars.

CHAPTER XIV.

INGERSOLL'S GOSPEL OF SCIENCE

Also Goes Against Him, for By It We May Explain, from Common-Sense Principles, Miracles and Inspiration.

He wants to fight us with science, so let us fight him with his own weapon. If there is anything to their so-called scientific analysis of articles of food, particularly brain food—and we have all reason to believe there is—I should advise Mr. Ingersoll to go west and eat an oat-field —oats and all.

But let us dispense with all jesting. While Mr. Ingersoll so highly extols science and I have lowered it in the thermometer of truth ninety-nine degrees out of a hundred, below his mark, still I wish to tell you that in the true spirit of science I lift it to a thousand times higher and grander and nobler spheres than does Mr. Ingersoll. Let us consider science from a really scientific standpoint; that done and the inspired thought, and all the miracles are plain enough.

Mr. Ingersoll, in that letter to the N. Y. Journal, gives a long list of the greatest miraculous wonders spoken

of in the Bible and says that all the inspiration, and every thing of a miraculous nature must be thrown away.

To begin with it is very evident that he is as ignorant as ignorance itself concerning the meaning of the word miracle. A miracle "is an act or event beyond the known laws of nature." What then, may not be called miraculous? We know that the food we eat makes that life-giving fluid the blood, and that each particular organ and all the different parts of the system draws its particular nourishment from the blood as it takes its course through the body, and all this through the ordained laws of nature; but who can comprehend, who can understand that law? Our laws, what are known as the laws of the land, are constantly changing; but the laws of nature are unchangeable. On that point Mr. Ingersoll and I cannot differ. I agree with him that "This is a natural world—that the endless chain of cause and effect has never been broken." And do not be frightened, dear reader, when I make the astounding declaration that the word supernatural must be dropped from the vocabulary of the English language, or our lexicographers must give us a reasonable definition for it. "Beyond nature" is the definition now given us. As for the word miracle it is true that some theologians tell us that a miracle is supernatural, a great work performed by unnatural means; but nothing could be more absurd. The Old Testament records about seventy miracles and it would be foolish to say that God went beyond his own fixed—ordained—laws to perform a miracle. For instance: a chemical experimenter finds that by properly concocting certain articles that a chemical process is performed and he has something else, entirely different, containing none of the original articles; but in perfect accord with nature's laws, how-

ever impossible it may be for man to understand the workings of those laws.

Sugar is composed of oxygen, nitrogen and carbon, and yet man cannot combine those elements and make sugar. Alcohol cannot be produced without sugar, but no sugar can be found in alcohol nor a trace of one of the component parts of sugar. And while man with sugar can produce alcohol, he cannot with alcohol produce sugar. Why? Because he don't know how. The atmosphere contains all the elements of sugar, and if man knew how to combine and concentrate those gases into sugar he could produce sugar from the very atmosphere. If we were to gaze toward yonder cloud and the mysterious sight of a stream of sugar pouring to the earth should meet our view we would say "This is marvelous in our eyes! What a miracle is this!" But would it be supernatural, according to the dictionary definition of the word, "beyond nature?" No. Would it be done by unnatural means? No. It would be done in a perfectly natural way that would be in perfect harmony with the ordained laws of nature. Could not He who created the universe, who holds it in His hand, as it were, cause a commotion in the atmosphere, among those gaseous elements and cause them to so combine that a chemical process would be performed the result of which would be the production of sugar? Scientists have already told us that the time is not far away when the clothing we wear will be produced from the atmosphere which we breathe.

Travelers in their journeys over sandy deserts have all beheld the strange sight of great streams of sand shooting like rockets several hundred feet into the air. They have also seen, from some great body of water, monstrous pillars or streams of water pouring from the ocean or lake into the air. Thinking men said, "There is a cause for

such phenomena," and set themselves about the task of learning the cause, and they have quite admirably succeeded. A book as cheap and as easy to get as the Physical Geography explains them.

During tornadoes houses burst outwardly as if there were a mighty pressure within too great for the building to withstand. Physical geography mentions a miraculous feat performed during a tornado in Kansas. A cow owned by a Mr. Martin was taken up and carried through the air a distance of about one hundred and forty rods, over the tops of trees, and allowed to alight upon the ground one hundred and forty rods from where it was taken, still alive and unharmed. And yet these would-be scientific, no-faith agnostics like Ingersoll scoff at the Bible record of Elijah having been carried to heaven in a chariot of fire, and also of a wind that drove the quails up from the sea into the camp of the Israelites and caused them to fly down so close to the ground that the people could easily reach them and gather them for food. But he wants science so let us go on.

In every known thing under heaven, according to science, there exists but a few substances, called elements, about sixty-five they tell us now, but they tell us also that, judging from what they know, it is altogether probable that everything in existence was formed from and could again be resolved to a single substance, or element, and that the same matter is used in the formation and production of every existing thing, not only in the animate division—animal and vegetable kingdom—but the mineral also, the only difference being in nature's way of combining, arranging and concocting that matter. For examples:

Carbon—pure charcoal—nature can make into diamonds.

Water is composed of oxygen and hydrogen. The combination of oxygen and hydrogen gases results in the production of water. Fill two tanks, one with oxygen, the other with hydrogen gas, run a tube from each tank into one jet, bringing the two gases together before letting it escape and you can thereby produce the most brilliant light, and a heat so intense that it will burn iron as a common fire will burn dry wood. *Notice now that while what we call water, in its natural state, will not burn, but is a most powerful extinguisher of fire, man can take the very elements of which that water is composed and produce the hottest fire.* So according to science it would be a very easy matter for this earth, water and all, to be consumed by fire according to the scriptural prophecies.

Take several different plants, one which will produce a bitter fruit, and a deadly poison; another sweet, another sour, but both excellent for food; cultivate and raise them all side by side, all drawing their nourishment from the same soil and the same heat and light and atmosphere and give me, if you can, the philosophy of it, outside of the common-sense idea that they are all nourished and produced from the same material or element; but by differently concocting, arranging and constituting that element entirely different articles are produced.

Oxygen, according to what scientists tell us, is the most forward element in existence, not only in the limpid fluid which covers the larger part of the surface of the earth; but in the rocks and stones scattered hither and yon. Oxygen enters largely into the composition of water and also of the hardest flint.

Geologists have found, deep within the bowels of the earth, entombed in cavities in great rocks such creatures as frogs and toads, which have when brought to the atmosphere showed themselves to be alive after having been

imprisoned in the rock for many hundreds of years without air and without food. Suspended animation? We do not care what they call it, all we ask of them is to be honest.

How now can any honest, sane human being say that he can believe these mysterious facts of science and yet does not believe the mysterious things of the Bible simply because he does not understand them, when many of the things that science tells us are as far beyond the understanding of man, and are as great and wonderful and mysterious and miraculous as any or all of the mysteries and miracles of the Bible? How can any honest, sane human being, declare his faith in the awe-inspiring incidents of science and yet be so foolish as to say with Ingersoll that "All the miracles of the Bible are the children of ignorance, cunning and mendacity?"

He says: "Throw away your suns that pause, your moons that rest, your quails and manna, your horns that level the walls of cities, the people who walk in fire without getting warm, your wandering jugglers who raise the dead, and cause pots to exude oil, your ravens that keep hotels and feed Prophets, your bushes that burn without being consumed, your clothes that refuse to wear out" etc. etc. If the Bible recorded incidents and miracles exactly like some that scientists relate such men as Ingersoll would brand them with the ridiculous and the impossible.

Consider man in his insignificant muscular and physical strength (or weakness) yet coupled with his intelligence what wonders does he perform! What powerful machinery is manipulated by the hand of man! Man knows how to put his machinery into motion and he knows how to stop it, and no honest man can say that He who created and manipulates the machinery of the universe could not as easily stop a planet in its course as a

man can put the brake onto a horsepower and stop it, or as an engineer can bring the machinery to a stand-still by shutting off steam.

When we consider, in the face of sound philosophy and true science, the strange and mysterious workings and formations and productions of the elements of the simple atmosphere which we breathe, it is foolish to say that the intelligent and designing mind of the universe, who is all scientific, and understands the philosophy of all things, could not cause manna to fall in the camp of the Israelites, or level the walls of cities, or give a man the power to raise a dead person, or influence a bird to carry food to a human being, and all this by natural means; but a means that man cannot give the whole philosophy of any more than he can give the entire philosophy of life, or of any element or substance in existence.

Ingersoll denies inspiration saying, "Throw away all the ravings of the inspired," and still he clings to science, and thus do we fight him with his own weapon, for you see that we need know very little of science to clearly define and prove inspiration and the working of miracles.

Science tells us that our thoughts are living things, and we know that all who are not, in angry passion or in quiet simplicity wading along in the cess-pool of ignorance, know for themselves, from observation and experience, that our thoughts are living things and that they travel the atmosphere, annihilating both space and substance, and often impress themselves upon the mind of somebody of whom we may be thinking. And just at this point comes to mind the proof of inspiration as taken from Ingersoll's argument in the lecture, (See chapter 3 of this book). "Oh!" somebody may say, "that is only a case of telepathy, mind-reading, her husband being alive

she knew his thoughts, and felt an inward evidence that he was alive, but did not know that she was being impressed with thoughts emanating from her husband's mind, from a human magnet. Allowed, but that does not effect the argument as a scientific proof of inspiration.

I suppose that our ability to influence other people by the quiet force of our mind depends a great deal upon the amount of those properties that science has named vitality and magnetism, which we possess, and also upon the sensitiveness of the person upon whom we put our mind. Now, to speak from a scientific standpoint, just as Mr. Ingersoll asks us to do, if man, only a midget of a magnet, without a look or a visible sign or a sound or a word, with his own thoughts can impress a fellow-creature it is but madness to say that the living omnipotent omniscient magnet in the boundless universe could not reveal his thoughts to one of his creatures at will, and no man can study the prophetic records of the Bible without knowing that God revealed a great deal of his mind concerning this world, to the Hebrew Prophets.

Faith is a parasite whose poisonous vines must be uprooted, says Ingersoll. Oh! but where is your science? Science tells us that there is that within man that makes him believe in the Deity and in the divine power. And you may talk and speculate as you will, and try as hard as you may to make yourself and others think that you do not believe; but *you know* that you *do believe*, and that in *spite* of yourself. Science tells us that the philosophy of miracles wrought by faith is, that that unseen element of the mind, in conjunction and operation with nature, causes an alchemical process, as it were, which performs the mystery.

Thus do we see that it is impossible to investigate science, with honesty and reason, without finding that the

miracles of the Bible are as easily performed as are the mysteries of science, and, like them, are performed by perfectly natural means. No transaction, strictly speaking, whether by man or by God can be unnatural.

Ingersoll calls for a gospel of humor; but according to science a righteous spirit of humor is produced only by the development and exercise of the moral and religious faculties.

Scientists have been at work endeavoring to extract from the walls of buildings the thoughts of men spoken within those buildings, the scientific fact being that as our thoughts are living things, possessing, in the technical terms of science, life and vitality and magnetism, they penetrate anything and leave their impression just as distinctly as the printing press leaves the impression of the type on the paper, so that man, if he could only learn how, could read thought as it becomes imprinted upon the atmosphere, or anything else, just as readily as he can read the printed matter from the paper.

Now, in the face of science and intelligence it would be unreasonable not to believe the Bible record that God keeps books and that a record is kept of each individual life, and that a book of life is kept in which is registered the names of those who accept the conditions of eternal life. It is in keeping with science and reason that a time of reckoning must come when the books will be opened. God does not do things by halves.

Brother Ingersoll denies these Bible truths and tries to argue them away; but bear with me while I repeat, he argues them into existence. Let us see whether he believes these things. On page 73 of the lecture where he exalts himself above accepting of the atonement of our Saviour he says, "I do not wish to go to heaven unless I can settle by the books."

See! There is that within man that compels him to believe, and acknowledge his belief, in these things, whether he would or not?

CHAPTER XV.

MISCELLANEOUS GLEANINGS.

Calvin—Voltaire—Methodist Converts—Flood—Babel Tower—Science —Good Times Coming.

Ingersoll says the "Presbyterian church was founded by John Calvin, a murderer!" And that "John Calvin, having power in Geneva, inaugurated human torture:"

What are the facts? John Calvin is not even *accused* of taking the life, himself directly, of even *one* individual; but he is *accused* of *causing* (notice that the accusation only could be produced) the death of an educated Spaniard, named Servetus, condemnation having been passed upon him to the effect that he should be committed alive, to the flames, because of the ideas he advanced regarding the Trinity. It is admitted that Calvin persecuted, and did not keep in the path of the gospel in his treatment of this man; but history tells us this: "That he exercised so arbitrary a control over the destiny of this unfortunate individual, as some have attempted to prove, there is much

reason to doubt." Yet Ingersoll would convey the idea to the public that Calvin inaugurated human torture whereby he and his followers tortured their fellow-men who would not succumb to their doctrines; but it is not true. Calvin was a great reformer, and to use the exact words of history, "At Geneva, as a central point, 'he was the light of the church, the oracle of the laws, and the fountain of literature and science. He was a powerful factor in causing the Roman church to abandon some of her abuses in doctrine and discipline.'"

For the purpose of this argument, just now, we will say that Calvin caused the death of that man, Servetus. One Robert G. Ingersoll of Boston, Mass., U. S. A., a great man who proposes the reformation of the world by a gospel which he calls his own, has caused the death of 12 individuals, to say the least. The New York papers gave an account of 12 people who took their life and left notice in their own hand writing, that Ingersoll's talk was the cause of it, and this in New York City alone.

So this great and good man, who says "he will never ask any God to treat him better than he treats his fellow-men," is a wholesale murderer whereas if the mere accusation, without any proof, of Calvin's *enemies* were true he caused the death of only one person.

Ingersoll says, "Voltaire abolished torture in France." Is it true? No. Who did? Napoleon Buonaparte, to whom the *world* ascribes the honor of having annihilated the inquisition.

He tells about the Methodists having "converted 130--000 folk in a year through the influence of 26,000 preachers, 226,000 Sunday-school scholars, and $100,000,000 of property. He consulted history and found there were 40 to 50 millions of people born a year and asks, "If they are saved at the rate of 130,000 a year, about how long

will it take that doctrine to save the world?"—"Consis-sistency thou art a jewel!" As though the aggregate conversions of the other evangelical societies did not far exceed the Methodist. He talks here as though the Methodist church was the only church. Well, well, quite a compliment for a noted infidel! But notice his reasoning again. Here he carries the idea that the church claims it will save the *whole world;* and on page 87 of the same book he carries the idea that the church claims that about *ninety-nine out of every hundred are doomed for hell.* Anything for argument.

Next, in the journal, he says, "We know that the story of the flood is not true; we know that the Tower of Babel story is idiotic:"

I wish he would explain how he knows the story of the deluge is false. This much is certain, as long as discoveries and events keep proving more and more the history and prophecies of the Bible we will be obliged to believe the Bible instead of Mr. Ingersoll. But we know, I quote from the "Museum of Antiquity," that "Berosus, the Chaldean historian quoted by Josephus; and Abidenus by Eusebius, Plutarch, Lucian, Molo, Nicholas Damascenus, as well as many of the heathen poets, mention the flood, and some traditions respecting it are to be found among the Americans and Chinese."

Speaking of Dr. Hall, he says, "He ought to know that there are two accounts of the flood. In one account Noah takes into the ark one pair of each species of living things; according to the other he takes seven pairs of the clean and one of the unclean."

I wonder if Mr. Ingersoll ever studied grammar. If so, I wonder if he ever learned the rules in his lesson and then with a good deal of confidence got his lesson out according to the rules, applying them as he supposed with

the skill of an expert, and boldly displayed his ability, to find, to his great surprise, that he had made very bungling work of the lesson for having adhered so strictly to his rules. How could that be? Why, by failing to read, or at least to heed, the exceptions to those rules, printed right under them. In this case, in sacred history, the rule was to take every living thing by two's, in pairs, the male and his female; when immediately came the exception to the rule, which was to take seven pairs of the clean.

I wish now to tell you of something still in existence and let the reader judge for himself whether "The Bible story of the Babel Tower," or Mr. Ingersoll's stories are idiotic. I never visited Babylon, the ancient city of Babel, so I will quote from the many who have been there, giving you the exact words of the "Museum of Antiquity:"

"The Ancient Tower of Babel is now a mound of oblong form, the total circumference of which is 2286 feet. At the Eastern side it is cloven by a deep furrow and is not more than fifty or sixty feet high, but on the Western side it rises to a conical figure"—notice the shape, exactly the shape that men undertaking to build such a tower, would make it—"to the elevation of 198 feet, and on its summit is a solid pile of brick thirty-seven feet in height and twenty-eight feet in breadth, diminishing in thickness to the top, which is broken and irregular and rent by large fissures extending through a third of its height; it is perforated with small holes. The fire-burnt bricks of which it is built have inscriptions on them, and so excellent is the cement that it is nearly impossible to extract one whole. The other parts of the summit of this hill are occupied by immense fragments of brick work of no determinate figure, tumbled together and converted

into solid vitrified masses, as if they had undergone the action of the fiercest fire or had been blown up by gun powder, the layers of brick being perfectly discernable." Consider now the shape of the mound, the solid pile of brick thirty-seven feet high and twenty-eight in breadth, the shape thereof and the powerful manner in which they are cemented, etc., and see if you could disbelieve the Bible story of the Babel Tower even though you wanted to.

The last sentence in his letter to the Journal is, "Science is the only possible savior of the human race." He should make himself better understood and tell us what science is to do this. It certainly cannot be Ingersoll's science of nothing.

What is science? Lexicography defines it thus: "Knowledge; truth ascertained." There are almost innumerable branches of science, and some of these branches are cut up into a great many subdivisions with each party contending for the truth of his own division, and every one of them at war with every one of them, each one preaching and teaching different ideas and theories, and pleading his case with the expertness of what they call scientific facts and arguments, which, to their mind, is evidence that they have ascertained the truth, and there may be twenty of them each claiming itself correct because they are called scientific. The medical science, for instance, the facts of which most everybody knows enough about so that we need not enlarge upon this subject.

Science, says the dictionary, is "truth ascertained," yet science we all know, often reverses itself and is constantly changing. Scientific, or "truth ascertained" facts, before they are hardly cold from the printing press are exploded, yea, the scientist often finds his own "truth ascertained" facts to be false before he gets them ready for

the press. Where then is your science, if science is "truth ascertained?" for bear in mind, truth is unchangeable while your science, so-called, is constantly changing; but when a thing really reaches a scientific basis and becomes a settled fact the world over, doubted by nobody, it is no longer called science—Why, what then? Oh, just common knowledge, every body knows it then. And right here comes in a really great truth spoken by Mr. Ingersoll: "This is a natural world, the endless chain of cause and effect has never been broken." But if we allow science the credit given it by him, his own statement just quoted, falls to the ground. The scientist endeavors to reason from cause to effect and from effect to cause, and arrives at a conclusion of a thing, and he works and tinkers and experiments and finds the conclusion correct, and he says, "Common-sense shows this to be true, and nature shows this to be true, and this link in the endless chain of cause and effect is welded together, and there is no breaking it," when, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," somebody proves the theory false and that link is snapped in two and the chain is broken.

Ingersoll believes "The time will come when the public thought will be so great and grand that it will be looked upon as infamous to perpetuate disease and man will not fill the future with consumption and insanity.

He is right in that idea, but he is looking in the wrong direction for those good times. But those good times are certainly coming. They will be here at the appointed time, for the Bible declares it. The Prophets have foretold it, and they have told us something of how it is to be done. It won't be done until after Jesus Christ comes and takes "the government upon his shoulders," and reigns king of kings, "from sea to sea and from the

river unto the ends of the earth." But as Ingersoll flatly and vehemently denies Christ the privilege of giving him a certificate of citizenship to that kingdom he won't be here to enjoy those good times.

CHAPTER XVI.

IN CONCLUSION.

I wish to say that I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Ingersoll and however strong I may have spoken in this book it is not because I have any feeling of ill-will for him ; and I have no apology to make and nothing from which to recant, unless convinced that I am wrong, and that by common-sense, honest argument ; but Mr. Ingersoll is not honest in his arguments, and that I have shown you over and over again in this book ; but look at one more instance found on page 79 of the lecture, where he says that we "believe in the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and eternal punishment of the wicked, and call that tidings of great joy," and that we "believe that God so loved the world that he made up his mind to damn the most of us." It matters not if you do call that wit or ironical sarcasm, because he knows that we believe that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life," thus giving sinful man an opportunity to be redeemed, and he knows also that that is what we call "tidings of great joy," and not that any were to enter condemnation ; and the only excuse possible to be

found for Mr. Ingersoll is that he "Is not willing to come to the light." If I could find no stronger argument to support my views than sarcasm, of an untruthful nature, call it wit or what you please, I would say nothing.

Would not your own feelings become quite intense towards those who call themselves honest infidel reasoners, as you considered these subjects while studying them as propounded by Mr. Ingersoll?—To get a better conception of the matter just now please turn back to chapter 2nd and read again Ingersoll's account of the penitent thief on the cross at the time of the Saviour's crucifixion.

A reverend gentleman was attending a camp-meeting in Sheldon, Vt. Before his turn came to preach, at the sound of the name of Ingersoll by a brother preacher, a voice was heard saying, "Oh, let the dead rest!" And after the above had taken place in a Methodist camp-meeting, I can imagine that this first brother (Rev. A. W. Ford) just ached to get into the pulpit himself. When the opportunity came he gave them a calling down. Among other things he said: "You can talk about such men as Washington and Lincoln and useful men of the past, but when you come to mention a man like Ingersoll, the devil says, 'Oh, let the dead rest!'"

This same Ford was living in Boston a few years ago. He was a man of the world who went in for a high-o-time. He made light of religion and the Bible the same as Ingersoll did. He wanted to make sure of heaven in the end but he did not want to leave the old behind and make for the new life. To use his own words, "I wanted to go to heaven but I wanted to climb up some other way," and if there was any way to do so he was bound to find it out. As a last resort he determined to see what Ingersoll could do for him.

Mr. Ingersoll was due to give his lecture, "What

Must We Do to be Saved?" Mr. Ford lotted on hearing him, perchance he might find a way to quiet his conscience without yielding to the gospel of Christ. He was disappointed, however, in not being able to arrange business matters so he could attend the lecture. What could be done? The next day some paper came out with the longed-for lecture in it. As soon as possible that evening, Mr. Ford, with an anxious heart, purchased a paper and hastened to his room to read the glad tidings that were to feed his hungry soul; but, alas! for he found no balm for the aching heart, no rest for the weary soul! Nothing to fill the aching void within! He was further than ever from discovering a means of "climbing up some other way," and now he must come to the gospel of Christ or remain undone forever.

"That lecture," said he, "had more to do than anything else, with my conversion. The unreasonableness of the thing," as he expressed it. That man became a Christian evangelist and for some years past has been a very conspicuous figure in the Vermont Methodist conference, known and loved as the Rev. A. W. Ford.

According to the testimony of converted infidels, to be plunged into a literal hell could not cause deeper agony of soul than they suffer, at times, by their fiendish clutch upon infidelity. Some of them have been honest enough, at times, even before their conversion, to acknowledge their feelings and convictions, and the only excuse they would make for not yielding to the voice of the spirit and of conscience would be the agonizing cry,, "I am an infidel! I am an infidel!" George Lovell, just previous to his conversion, when down on his knees in agony of soul used these very words.

The noted Tom Payne was at a dinner party once when a controversy arose concerning the future destiny of

man. A lady said to him, "Why do you not say something, we want to hear from you," to which he replied, "Madame, I have nothing to say, I am silent of necessity. I have friends in both places." The awful death-bed scene of Tom Payne is too well known to need mentioning here.

Voltaire, when old, was stricken with weakness and disease, and thinking his end at hand he was frightened and cried aloud for a priest, and the priest came and Voltaire confessed. "But," according to the Encyclopædia Brittanica, "he recovered and scoffed at himself as usual." This Voltaire, although an open enemy to the Bible and Christianity and an avowed infidel-preacher and spreader of infidel doctrines that led to the French Revolution, in a moment of conscientious thought expressed himself in a noted poem thus :—I quote from Guizot's History of France:—

"O God, whom men ignore, whom everything reveals,
Hear thou the latest words of him who now appeals,
'Tis searching out thy law that hath bewildered me;
My heart may go astray, but it is full of Thee."

The same history speaks of Diderot, one of Voltaire's associates, as being an avowed infidel and as having become the boldest of the leaders in the crusade against Christianity, which led to the French Revolution. It says that he would recognize no moral law but the natural impulse of the soul and quotes him as saying, "There is no virtue or vice, but innate goodness or badness;" and yet in one literary production he wrote, "O God I know not whether Thou art, but I will think as if thou didst see into my soul, I will act as if I were in thy presence."

I care not how smart, secretive or shrewd a person may be it is impossible to go through life and not reveal a belief in the Deity. In these words they are talking directly to the God they deny.

An infidel was asked by a little girl over whom he was guardian, if it was any use to pray, and he told her "Yes." On telling about it after his conversion he said, "Of course I told her yes, what else could I say?" Another infidel was asked by his dying daughter, "Whose faith do you want me to die in, yours or mother's?" "Your mother's, by all means," was his immediate and earnest reply.

Mark Twain, notwithstanding his pretended infidelity, makes the astonishing acknowledgement that his head is caused to swim in the depths of the surging ocean of bewilderment when he thinks of the insignificant little country that gave birth to Christianity. I will quote a few words from his "Innocents Abroad:"

"One of the most astonishing things that have yet fallen under our observation is the exceedingly small portion of the earth from which sprang the now flourishing plant of Christianity. The longest journey our Saviour ever performed was from here," (Capernaum) "to Jerusalem—about one hundred to one hundred and twenty miles. The places made most particularly celebrated by the presence of Christ are nearly all right here in full view, and within cannon-shot of Capernaum. Leaving out two or three short journeys of the Saviour, he spent his life, preached his gospel, and performed his miracles within a compass no larger than an ordinary county in the United States. *It is as much as I can do to comprehend this stupifying fact.*" (The italics are mine.)

Many believers have either read or heard these sayings of Ingersoll's and have been harrassed by doubts and fears, and have thus been troubled concerning these things, and thinking that they could not answer him to their satisfaction, and failing to look into the matter suf-

ficiently to eliminate every doubt, they have said or thought, "Well, I don't know but there is something to Ingersoll's talk after all."

But the very fact that we may connive as we please to find true peace and rest outside of the gospel of Christ, but always in vain, should be enough to keep us from going after anything else. The very fact that no man can think of the Bible, that no man can take the Bible into his hands without feeling an influence for good, and receiving an impression different and greater than comes to him from thinking about or touching any other book or writing that was ever produced or ever will be produced, and brings to him involuntarily, a feeling that God is, and that that book contains information from the Eternal, should be sufficient evidence for anybody.

In closing I wish to say that I desire to cast no reflections upon any good work, word or deed, whether of Mr. Ingersoll's or anybody's else. The object of this book is to give to its readers the results of my thinking and earnest meditation upon some of the thoughts written by Ingersoll, that caused me to say, I will try and see what there is in this. And believing that the thoughts to which that study gave rise were worth printing, I said, I will write a book, and I trust that my belief will prove to be well founded. I hope and pray that this book may prove interesting, instructive and beneficial to many readers. And if there is anything in argument where now do you place Ingersollism, in the front ranks or in the back-ground? *I would like to hear from you.*

With good wishes for you, dear reader, for Mr. Ingersoll and all mankind, I am,

Sincerely yours for good,

PAGE ALFRED COCHRAN.

CHAPTER XVII.

SINCE INGERSOLL DIED.

After having written this reply to Ingersoll (while it was being type-written) Mr. Ingersoll passed away. His address at his brother's funeral has just been printed in the newspapers. He said a few things which I wish to quote: "Every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love and every moment jewelled with a joy, will at its close become a tragedy as sad and deep and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death. Life is a narrow veil between the peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud and the only answer is the echo of our wailing."

Agnosticism cries into the deeps of darkness and mystery and death and the only answer possible for them to receive is the resounding echo from the depths of darkness and mystery and death; but the answer of those who cry unto him who said, "Come unto me and I will give you rest," is one of light and life, and the power and scope of that faith "looks beyond the heights" in defiance of darkness and mystery and death. Those who cry to him who said, "Look unto me and be ye saved," receive an answer of comfort and peace and rest, and look upon death as a stepping stone to the "Heights beyond." How

different is this from those who "cry and their only answer is the echo of their wailing!"

Agnosticism cries into the dark and receives darkness for a reply. The faith of Jesus Christ cries to the "Light of Life" and receives the Light of Life for a reply and catches a glimpse "beyond the heights" and jubilantly shouts, "Life! Life! Eternal Life!"

In the last chapter of the lecture Ingersoll says, "If it goes hard with me, I will stand it, and I will cling to my logic, and I will bear it like a man." But in the gospel of Christ there is no ifs about it. There is no fearing that we may be wrong; but "God's spirit bears witness with ours that we are his children, and if children then heirs, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and that fadeth not away." That is the result of a perfect faith, delineated by the great apostle: "Faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen." And I propose to rest on the sure foundation to remaining in the darkness of doubt which all sceptics acknowledge they are in. There is a feeling of certainty and safety there which does not relentlessly throw in our face that "wailing echo" from the regions "of darkness and mystery and death."

Mr. Ingersoll always expressed a desire "to die suddenly and without warning." But why such a desire? I do not believe that any man unless afraid to die and without any intentions of making a preparation, but rather whose day of grace is sinned away, could wish to die suddenly and without warning.

It is stated by the newspapers that he used to say that the Bible was a most beautiful book and he would give all he had if he could believe in its promises. Had he done as the book told him, "Take heed that the light which is in thee be not darkness," and asked in Jesus' name for the revelation

of those beautiful promises, in other words had he put the gospel to the test, studied the Bible to know the truth, regardless of whether it corresponded with the natural man or not he would have been able to claim those promises; but he utterly refused to ask in Jesus' name. He plainly said that he was above it.

An evangelist was holding revival services when there appeared at the altar a man who was groaning under the burden of his sins and did not receive relief. The secret of it was that he acknowledged God, but would not acknowledge Christ as his mediator, and in the midst of his crying to God for mercy, he was prevailed upon to cry, "O God, for Christ's sake, forgive my sins," when immediately he received the light, the promises of that beautiful book were his, with conscious evidence of his acceptance with God.

Rev. A. B. Earle, of the City of Albany, was holding revival services and had at the altar eleven young men. One of them failed to receive a verification of the promises. The rest were much interested in him and were earnestly interceding in his behalf, and he prayed, "Hear me, O God, for the sake of these dear friends who are so interested in me." Mr. Earle suggested that he say, "O God, for Christ's sake, hear me!" He followed the suggestion and immediately the light burst in upon his soul.

If Mr. Ingersoll was honest when he said that he would give all he had if he could believe in the promises of the Bible then the fact of his not embracing Christianity was good evidence that his day of grace was sinned away.

To conclude with: I do not wish to excite anybody to hard feelings toward a fellow-man even though he be an infidel; but I do say that unbelief in the gospel of Christ should not be recognized as a respectable element in the heart of man or in society. I do not say that Mr. Inger-

soll was a bad man when you touch his personal character and disposition; but I do say that it is an uncompromisingly serious thing for a man to undertake as did Ingersoll, to deprive us of the most beautiful gifts and promises that God could bestow upon the children of men and put within us a yearning after those things and give us for an "answer only the echo of our wailing."

QUOTATIONS FROM THE SECULAR PRESS.

The Philadelphia Times says:

"He possessed in high degree the qualities that endeared a man to his fellows." It says that he was "generous and charitable; a devoted husband, a kind father, a generous neighbor." I do not doubt it. It also says: "His fatal fault was that he paraded his unbelief and thought to destroy the faith of others. He tried to tear down the dearest possession God has given his children, and offered nothing in its place. Therefore is this man's name, which should have been placed so high, written in the sand."

The New York Express says:

"Probably the worst that can be said of the Colonel is that he was a religious gamin. He was not of the sort who undermind the foundation of belief—no such hard work for him, thank you. He was rather the bad boy, with sun-burned legs and tow hair, who 'rocks' the congregation at church on Sunday mornings and tempts the good boy off to the swimming hole or the fishing weir. If we press for convictions in a higher degree, Ingersoll may have to plead to a charge of religious demagogism. Starting in revolt against only the forbidding unloveliness of congregational Puritanism, he seems to have been led,

demagogue fashion, into the general unsettlement of the minds of superficial folk merely by the discovery that he could unsettle them. If not, we are driven to the disagreeable conclusion that he preached spiritual annihilation for the money in it. He had no substitute gospel, save a vague naturalism. But the more rational conclusion is that his irresponsibility proceeded from the delight in swaying large bodies of people, which actuates the political demagogue. It is pretty certain that Ingersoll took little thought of the number of imperfectly educated young men for whom his clever mockery of things which they had revered made excuses for evil courses. It was this influence of his, undoubtedly, which caused the religious societies to combat him so vigorously and to labor so hard for his conversion. These good people were undoubtedly much worried by his life. They may calm themselves at his death. With the last echo of his mellow voice silenced, and the last twinkle of his bright wit quenched, his influence is exhausted."

From the New York Mail and Express:

"In the large sense of the word, Col. Ingersoll's life was a failure. He was a phrase-maker and magician, who fascinated his hearers but never instructed them. He painted beautiful pictures but they faded like mists in the sunshine. He was a destroyer as far as he could be, and had nothing to offer in place of that which he destroyed. He taught only the gospel of doubt and dark despair; his spiritual vocabulary contained no such word as faith and in all the beautiful things he ever said he never brought cheer to an aching heart nor hope to a troubled soul. The ideals and aspirations which he decried still thrill the heart of humanity; the institutions at which he scoffed still shed their benign radiance upon the races of the earth,

and he leaves the earth without having added even a fragment to its knowledge or a single ray of light to its joys or hopes.

"Colonel Ingersoll failed not only for the world but for himself. If he was an honest seeker after truth he was a most unfortunate one. For with a badly poised mind which disputes the existence of all things which it cannot comprehend, he barred the gates against his own progress and became a hopeless wanderer in the gloomy marshes of doubt. And so he passes, like a shadow, while the faith which he assailed still brightens the world."

From the New York Voice, New York:

"Ingersoll's assaults upon religious faith were not the product of any deep research, laborious scholarship, or intellectual strain. His weapons were sarcasm, flippant smartness, catchy rhetoric and at times an eloquent and obviously sincere appeal to the feelings of justice and humanity, so often outraged, as we all know, in the history of the church."

Although his speech was flowery, and his phrases beautifully constructed, still many declare that after you had seen and heard him once it was all over with, they would not go across the road to hear him again. He said if he had a soul he wanted it saved, but it would be saved through his own goodness or not at all. Although he frankly acknowledged that he did not find the truth, still he declared it unintelligent, insane and idiotic to believe in Christianity.

Thus bearing aloft the sceptre of his own righteousness he flopped his wings of intelligence and soared above us, above the gospel of Jesus Christ. He ascended the heights of logic. He stood upon the mountain peaks of or-

atory. And beholding ignorance in the valley below he poured forth his oratorical eloquence in phraseology so attractive, in literary style so captivating, that he labored under the delusion that he would obliterate Christianity. But the gospel of Jesus Christ has come to stay. Other things flourish and die away; they sparkle, they glitter, and then they are gone. But the gospel of Christ, never. The good old book will stand.

PART OF INGERSOLL'S LAST POEM.

(Copied from Literary Digest.)

"The simple truth is what we ask,
Not the ideal;
We've set ourselves the noble task
To find the real.
If all there is is naught but dross,
We want to know and bear our loss.

We have no God to serve or fear;
No hell to shun;
No devil with malicious leer.
When life is done
An endless sleep may close our eyes—
A sleep with neither dreams nor sighs.

When cyclones rend—when lightning blights,
'Tis nought but fate;
There is no God of wrath who smites
In heartless hate.
Behind the things that injure man
There is no purpose, thought, or plan.

The jewelled cup of love we drain,
And friendship's wine
"Now swiftly flows in every vein
With warmth divine.
And so we love and hope and dream
That in death's sky there is a gleam."

We do not pray, or weep, or wail,
We have no dread,
No fear to pass beyond the veil
That hides the dead.
And yet we question, dream and guess;
But knowledge we do not possess.

We ask, yet nothing seems to know;
We cry in vain.
There is no 'master of the show'
Who will explain,
Or from the future tear the mask,
And yet we dream, and still we ask:

Is there beyond the silent night
An endless day?
Is death a door that leads to light?
We cannot say.
The tongueless secret locked in fate
We do not know. We hope and wait."

If we will stop right here and do a little reasoning we will see that this is unscientific and silly. It not only contradicts his prose literature but it contradicts itself.

He tells us at the beginning of one verse that all is fate, "*the inevitable*," foreordained, predestinated, and then he closes the same verse with a square contradiction, making everything one conglomerate mass of happenstance, irregularity, disorder and confusion, thus himself pulling down the temple of reason that he asks us to rear upon the foundation stone of "This is a natural world, the endless chain of cause and effect has never been broken."

See third verse: "Nought but fate. No purpose, thought, or plan." What does fate mean? A foreordained event; doom predetermined. Webster defines fated, thus: "Decreed by fate, determined; appointed."

And fate: "An inevitable necessity depending upon a superior cause; or a fixed sentence whereby the order of things is irreversibly determined."

Now you see according to this poem the truth of these religious questions, which are the most interesting and dominating subjects of the day, are "locked in fate," it is unknowable, and this fateful condition of affairs cannot be reversed and yet at the very beginning of this poem they tell us that they ask for this truth and have set themselves the task of finding it and he has called it a noble task; but I should call it an idiotic undertaking if I pretended to know that it was "locked in fate."

Then he said, "If all is dross, we want to know and bear our loss." Is not that silly, indeed? If we *have nothing* how can we *lose something? If all is dross what is there to lose?*

And yet they are trying to persuade us that we should pawn off this golden beauty, Christianity, and receive in its place only this dross of agnosticism—*notice that dross is Ingersoll's name for it too.* But let these followers of Ingersoll get all they can out of this poem, of fate theory; and its perfect anthithesis; no purpose, thought, or plan theory, still they must acknowledge that where a decree is there must be something or somebody to make that decree, and it cannot be done without some purpose, thought or plan. There must be a cause according to Ingersoll's own gospel, yet he denies it in this poem, and there must be something or somebody to carry out that decree. So with one breath we hear him arguing for predestination by telling us that every ill is "naught but fate," all preappointed, purposed, thought out and planned, with no way of escape; and with the very next breath that he drew he contradicted it, reversed the thing completely, declaring it all to be without "purpose, thought, or plan."

But if "There is no purpose, thought, or plan, behind the things that injure man," then there can be none behind the things that benefit him. So one moment he calls for order, a "natural world—cause and effect"—and the next moment he flings all together into one gigantic heap of debris—disorder aud confusion.

We speak of the fated cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, and according to both sacred and profane history these cities were fated. And according to this poem of Ingersoll's which the advanced thinkers, as they call themselves, extol, and according to Ingersoll's own gospel of cause and effect, there must have been somebody to make that decree in purpose, thought, and plan. There must have been a cause from the beginning of those cities until their doom was sealed and they had met their fate in fulfillment of prophecy. And the same may be said of the decree concerning the Jews, made hundreds of years ago, that if they would walk in the statutes of God it would be well with them and they should stand at the head of nations; but if not they were to lose their nationality for a certain time, it should go hard with them, they should be persecuted and driven hither and yon and scattered among all nations and become a proverb and a by-word. Was there no cause for all this? Was there nobody to make that decree or to carry it out? Was there no purposing, no thinking, no planning? Do you not see that Ingersoll in this poem denies his own gospel? That decree, prophecy, concerning the Jews has been literally carried out to the present day and will continue to be until that race of people are again reunited in one body and inhabiting the land of Canaan in peace and prosperity and heading the list of the nations of the earth. And thus might we continue for many a page or even chapter.

Perhaps Ingersoll ought to have had the "s" added to fate to make it Fates (Myths), goddesses, sisters three, their business being to "spin the destinies of men" and snap asunder the brittle thread of life at the arrival of the appointed hour of death. Who knows but he arranged with them to carry out his wish to "die suddenly and without warning,"seeing he had such faith in Fates—fate. But how much more reasonably has the great poet Milton used the word:

"Others, apart, sat on a hill retired,
In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate."

In the fifth verse here he says, "We do not pray, or weep, or wail, or fear," etc., but in his address at his brother's funeral we found him fearing and crying and wailing. You will remember that he said, "We cry and the only answer is the echo of our wailing." Furthermore, the first verse here is all prayer. The sixth verse is all prayer. A part of the last verse is prayer.

But who does he question so earnestly, who does he ask? Man, or beast, or God, or the devil? But, "we do not pray?" Why, in the latter part of that very verse we find him groaning under the burden of unanswered prayer. And why? Because he would not give up his pride and come down from the perch of self-exaltation and ask in the name of the One who came to redeem us that he might own the "beautiful promises of the bible," which he said he would give all he possessed if he could believe in. The fact of the matter is, these fellows want to win heaven, but they want to "climb up some other way;" they are not willing to pass through the lofty valley of humiliation and enter the door—Jesus Christ. They seek to tear the door from its hinges, but their efforts are fruitless.

But, Mr. Ingersoll has gone from us. All talk and cavil concerning his destiny *(but not his doctrines)* is useless, but whether he would or not, he must come forth as all must do "to the resurrection of life; or the resurrection of damnation—the lake of fire which is the second death."

To honestly express my opinion, Mr. Ingersoll was worst kind of a sceptic. As the moderate drinkers of spiritous liquors are a terror to temperance workers and sobriety, and all reform work, being the manufacturers of inebriates and drunkards, in short, the perpetuators of all the evils of the Colossal Rum Curse, so an agnostic like Mr. Ingersoll is the worst kind of a sceptic that Christianity has to deal with.

What Must We Do to Be Saved?

By ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PREFACE.

If what is known as the Christian Religion is true, nothing can be more wonderful than the fact that Matthew, Mark and Luke say nothing about "salvatiou by faith;" that they do not even hint at the doctrine of the atonement. and are as silent as empty tombs as to the necessity of believing anything to secure happiness in this world or another.

For a good many years it has been claimed that the writers of these gospels knew some things of the teachings of Christ, and had at least, a general knowledge of the conditions of salvation. It now seems to be substantiated that the early christians did not place implicit confidence in the gospels, and did not hesitate to make such changes and additions as they thought proper. Such changes and additions are about the only passages in the New Testament that the Evangelical Churches now consider sacred. That portion of the last chapter of Mark, in which unbelievers are so cheerfully and promptly damned, has been shown to be an interpolation, and it is asserted that in the revised edition of the New Testament, soon to be issued, the infamous pages will not appear. With these expunged, there is not one word in Matthew, Mark or Luke, even tending to show that belief in Christ has, or can have, any effect upon the destiny of the soul.

The four gospels are the four corner stones upon which rests the fabric of orthodox Christianity. Three of these stones have crumbled, and the fourth is not likely to outlast this generation. The gospel of John cannot alone uphold the infinite absurdity of vicarious virtue and vice, and cannot, without the aid of "interpolation" sustain the illogical and immoral dogma of salvation by faith. These frightful doctrines must be abandoned; the miraculous must be given up, the wonderful stories must be expunged, and from the creed of noble deeds the forgeries of superstition must be blotted out. From the

temple of Morality and Truth—from the great windows towards the sun—the parasitic and poisonous vines of faith and fable must be torn.

The church will be compelled at last to rest its case, not upon the wonders Christ is said to have performed, but upon the system of morality he taught. All the miracles, including the resurrection and ascension, are, when compared with portions of the "Sermon on the Mount," but dust and darkness.

The careful reader of the New Testament will find three Christs described:—One who wished to preserve Judaism—one who wished to reform it, and one who built a system of his own The Apostles and their disciples, utterly unable to comprehend a religion that did away with sacrifices, churches, priests, and creeds, constructed a Christianity for themselves, so that the orthodox churches of to-day rest—*first*, upon what Christ endeavored to destroy—*second*, upon what he never said, and, *third*, upon a misunderstanding of what he did say.

If a certain belief is necessary to insure the salvation of the soul, the church ought to explain, and without any unnecessary delay, why such an infinitely important fact was utterly ignored by Matthew, Mark and Luke. There are only two explanations possible. Either belief is unnecessary, or the writers of these three gospels did not understand the Christian system. The "sacredness" of the subject cannot longer hide the absurdity of the "scheme of salvation," nor the failure of Matthew, Mark and Luke, to mention, what is now claimed to have been, the entire mission of Christ. The church must take from the New Testament the supernatural; the idea that an intellectual conviction can subject an honest man to eternal pain—the awful doctrine that the innocent can justly suffer for the guilty, and allow the remainder to be discussed, denied or believed without punishment and without reward. No one will object to the preaching of kindness, honesty and justice. To preach less is a crime, and to practice more is impossible.

There is one thing that ought to be impressed upon the average theologian, and that is the utter futility of trying to answer arguments with personal abuse. It should be understood once for all that these questions are in no sense personal. If it should turn out that all the professed christians in the world are sinless saints, the question of how Matthew, Mark and Luke, came to say nothing about the atonement and the scheme of salvation by faith, would still be asked. And if it should then be shown that all the doubters, deists, and atheists, are vile and vicious wretches, the question still would wait for a reply.

The origin of all religions, creeds, and sacred books, is substantially the same, and the history of one is, in the main, the history of all. Thus far these religions have been the mistaken explanations of our surroundings. The appearances of nature have imposed upon the ignorance and fear of man. But back of all honest creeds was, and is, the desire to know, to understand, and to explain, and that desire will, as I most ardently hope and earnestly believe, be gratified at last by the discovery of the truth. Until then let us bear with the theories, hopes, dreams, mistakes aud honest thoughts of all.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Oct., 1880.

WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED?

"THE NUREMBURG MAN WAS OPERATED BY A COMBINATION OF PIPES AND LEVERS, AND THOUGH HE COULD BREATHE AND DIGEST PERFECTLY, AND EVEN REASON AS WELL AS MOST THEOLOGIANS, WAS MADE OF NOTHING BUT WOOD AND LEATHER."

I.

The whole world has been filled with fear. Ignorance has been the refuge of the soul. For thousands of years the intellectual ocean was ravaged by the buccaneers of reason. Pious souls clung to the shore and looked at the lighthouse. The seas were filled with monsters and the islands with sirens. The people were driven in the middle of a narrow road while priests went before, beating the hedges on either side to frighten the robbers from their lairs. The poor fellows seeing no robbers, thanked their brave leaders with all their hearts.

Huddled in folds they listened with wide eyes while the Shepherd told of ravening wolves. With great gladness they exchanged their fleeces for security. Shorn and shivering, they had the happiness of seeing their protectors comfortable and warm.

Through all the years, those who plowed divided with those who prayed. Wicked industry supported pious idleness, the hut gave to the cathedral, and frightened poverty gave even its rags to buy a robe for hypocrisy.

Fear is the dungeon of the mind, and superstition is a dagger with which hypocrisy assassinates the soul. Courage is liberty. I am in favor of absolute freedom of thought. In the realm of mind every one is monarch; every one is robed, sceptered and crowned, and every one wears the purple of authority. I belong to the republic of intellectual liberty, and only those are good citizens of that republic who depend upon reason and upon persuasion, and only those are traitors who resort to brute force.

Now, I beg of you all to forget just for a few moments that you are Methodists or Baptists or Catholics or Presbyterians, and let us for an hour or two remember only that we are men and women. And allow me to say "man" and "woman" are the highest titles that can be bestowed upon humanity.

Let us, if possible, banish all fear from the mind. Do not imagine that there is some being in the infinite expanse who is not willing that every man and woman should think for himself and herself. Do not imagine that there is any being who would give to his children the holy torch of reason, and then damn them for following that sacred light. Let us have courage.

Priests have invented a crime called "blasphemy," and behind that crime hypocrisy has crouched for thousands of years. There is but one blasphemy, and that is injustice. There is but one worship, and that is justice!

You need not fear the anger of a god that you cannot injure. Rather fear to injure your fellow-men. Do not be afraid of a crime you cannot commit. Rather be afraid of one that you may commit. The reason that you cannot injure God is that the infinite is conditionless. You cannot increase or diminish the happiness of any being without changing that being's condition. If God is conditionless, you can neither injure nor benefit him.

There was a Jewish gentleman went into a restaurant to get his dinner, and the devil of temptation whispered in his ear: "Eat some bacon." He knew if there was anything in the universe, calculated to excite the wrath of an infinite being, who made every shining star, it was to see a gentleman eating bacon. He knew it, and he knew the infinite being was looking, that he was the eternal eavesdropper of the universe. But his appetite got the better of his conscience, as it often has with us all, and he ate that bacon. He knew it was wrong, and his conscience felt the blood of shame in its cheek. When he went into that restaurant the weather was delightful, the sky was as blue as June, and when he came out the sky was covered with angry clouds, the lightning leaping from one to another, and the earth shaking beneath the voice of the thunder. He went back into that restaurant with a face as white as milk, and he said to one of the keepers:

"My God, did you ever hear such a fuss about a little piece of bacon?"

As long as we harbor such opinions of infinity; as long as we imagine the heavens to be filled with such tyranny, just so long the sons of men will be cringing, intellectual cowards. Let us think, and let us honestly express our thought.

Do not imagine for a moment that I think people who disagree with me are bad people. I admit, and I cheerfully admit, that a very large proportion of mankind, and a very large majority, a vast number are reasonably honest. I believe that most christians believe what they teach; that most ministers are endeavoring to make this world better. I do not pretend to be better than they are. It is an intellectual question. It is a question, first, of intellectual liberty, and after that, a question to be settled at the bar of human reason. I do not pretend to be better than they are. Probably I am a good deal worse than many of them, but that is not the question. The question is: "Bad as I am have I the right to think?" And I think I have for two reasons:

First, I cannot help it. And secondly, I like it.

The whole question is right at a point. If I have not a right to express my thoughts, who has?

"Oh," they say, "we will allow you to think, we will not burn you."

"All right; why won't you burn me?"

"Because we think a decent man will allow others to think and to express his thought."

"Then the reason you do not persecute me for my thought is that you believe it would be infamous in you?"

"Yes."

"And yet you worship a God who will, as you declare, punish me forever?"

Surely an infinite God ought to be as just as man. Surely no God can have the right to punish his children for being honest. He should not reward hypocrisy with heaven, and punish candor with eternal pain.

The next question then is: Can I commit a sin against God by thinking? If God did not intend I should think, why did he give me a thinker? For one, I am convinced, not only that I have the right to think, but that it is my duty to express my honest thoughts. Whatever the gods may say we must be true to ourselves.

We have got what they call the Christian system of religion, and thousands of people wonder how I can be wicked enough to attack that system.

There are many good things about it, and I shall never attack anything that I believe to be good! I shall never fear to attack anything I honestly believe to be wrong! We have what they call the Christian religion, and I find, just in proportion that nations have been religious, just in the proportion they have clung to the religion of their founders, they have gone back to barbarism. I find that Spain, Portugal, Italy, are the three worst nations in Europe. I find that the nation nearest infidel is the most prosperous—France.

And so I say there can be no danger in the exercise of absolute intellectual freedom. I find among ourselves the men who think are at least as good as those who do not.

We have, I say a Christian system, and that system is founded upon what they are pleased to call the "New Testament." Who wrote the New Testament? I do not know. Who does know? Nobody. We have found many manuscripts containing portions of the New Testament. Some of these manuscripts leave out five or six books—many of them. Others more; others less. No two of these manuscripts agree. Nobody knows who wrote these manuscripts. They are all written in Greek. The disciples of Christ, so far as we know, knew only Hebrew. Nobody ever saw, so far as we know, one of the original Hebrew manuscripts. Nobody ever saw anybody who had heard of anybody that had ever seen anybody that had ever seen one of the original Hebrew manuscripts. No doubt the clergy of your city have told you these facts thousands of times, and they will be obliged to me for having repeated them once more. These manuscripts are written in what are called capital Greek letters. They are called Unical manuscripts, and the New Testament was not divided into chapters and verses, even until the year of grace 1551. In the original the manuscripts and gospels are signed by nobody. The epistles are addressed to nobody; and they are signed by the same person. All the addresses, all the pretended ear-marks showing to whom they were written, are simply interpolations, and everybody who has studied the subject knows it.

It is further admitted that even these manuscripts have not been properly translated, and they have a syndicate now making a new translation; and I suppose that I cannot tell whether I really believe the New Testament or not until I see that new translation.

You must remember, also, one other thing. Christ never wrote a solitary word of the New Testament—not one word. There is an account that he once stooped and wrote something in the sand, but that has not been preserved. He never told anybody to write a word.

He never said Matthew, remember this. Mark, do not forget to put that down. Luke, be sure that in your gospel you have this. John, do not forget it." Not one word. And it has always seemed to me that a being coming from another world, with a message of infinite importance to mankind, should at least have verified that message, by his own signature. Is it not wonderful that not one word was written by Christ? Is it not strange that He gave no orders to have his words preserved—words upon which hung the salvation of a world?

Why was nothing written? I will tell you. In my judgement they expected the end of the world in a few days. That generation was not to pass away until the heavens should be rolled up as a scroll, and until the earth should melt with fervent heat. That was their belief. They believed that the world was to be destroyed, and that there was to be another coming, and the saints were then to govern the earth. And they even went so far among the apostles, as we frequently do now before election, as to divide out the offices in advance. This Testament as it now is, was not written for hundreds of years after the apostles were dust. Many of the pretended facts lived in the open mouth of credulity. They were in the waste-baskets of forgetfulness. They depended upon the innaccuracy of legend, and for centuries these doctrines and stories were blown about by the inconstant winds. And when reduced to writing, some gentleman would write by the side of the passage, his idea of it, and the next copyist would put that in as a part of the text. And when it was mostly written, and the church got into trouble, and wanted a passage to help it out, one was interpolated to order. So that now it is among the easiest things in the world to pick out at least one hundred interpolations in the Testament. And I will pick some of them out before I get through.

And let me say here, once for all, that for the man Christ I have infinite respect. Let me say, once for all, that the place where man has died for man is holy ground. And let me say once for all, that to the great and serene man I gladly pay, gladly pay, the tribute of my admiration and my tears. He was a reformer in his day. He was an infidel in his time. He was regarded as a blasphemer, and his life was destroyed by hypocrites, who have in all ages, done what they could to trample freedom and manhood out of the human mind. Had I lived at that time I would have been his friend, and should he come again he will not find a better friend than I will be.

That is for the man. For the theological creation I have a different feeling. If he was, in fact, God, he knew there was no such thing as death. He knew that what we called death was but the eternal opening of the golden gates of everlasting joy; and it took no heroism to face a death that was eternal life.

But when a man, when a poor boy sixteen years of age, goes upon the field of battle to keep his flag in heaven, not knowing but that death ends all; not knowing but that when the shadows creep over him, that darkness will be eternal, there is heroism. For the man who in the darkness, said: "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—for that man I have nothing but respect, admiration, and love. Back of the theological shreds, rags and patches, hiding the real Christ, I see a genuine man.

A while ago I made up my mind to find out what was necessary for me to do in order to be saved. If I have got a soul, I want it saved. I do not wish to lose anything that is of value.

For thousands of years the world has been asking that question: "What must we do to be saved?"

Saved from poverty? No. Saved from crime? No. Tyranny? No. But "What must we do to be saved from the eternal wrath of the God who made us all?"

If God made us, he will not destroy us. Infinite wisdom never made a poor investment. Upon all the works of an infinite God, a dividend must finally be declared. Why should God make failures? Why should he waste material? Why should he not correct his mistakes, instead of damning them? The pulpit has cast a shadow over even the cradle. The doctrine of endless punishment has covered the cheeks of this world with tears. I despise it, and I defy it.

I made up my mind, I say, to see what I had to do to save my soul according to the Testament, and thereupon I read it. I read the gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and found that the church had been deceiving me. I found that the clergy did not understand their own book; that they had been building upon passages that had been interpolated; upon passages that were entirely untrue, and I will tell you why I think so.

II

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

According to the church, the first Gospel was written by Matthew. As a matter of fact he never wrote a word of it—never saw it, never heard of it, and probably never will. But for the purposes of this lecture I admit that he wrote it. I will admit that he was with Christ for three years; that he was his constant companion; that he shared his sorrows and his triumphs; that he heard his words by the lonely lakes, the barren hills, in synagogue and street, and that he knew his heart and became acquainted with his thoughts and aims.

Now let us see what Matthew says we must do in order to be saved. And I take it that, if this is true, Matthew is as good authority as any minister in the world.

The first thing I find upon the subject of salvation is in the fifth chapter of Matthew, and it is embraced in what is commonly known as the Sermon on the Mount. It is as follows:

"Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Good!

"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." Good! whether they belong to any church or not; whether they believe the bible or not?

"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." Good!

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Good.

In the same sermon he says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law of the Prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." And then he makes use of his remarkable language, almost as applicable to-day as it was then. "For I say unto you that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." Good.

In the sixth chapter I find the following, and it comes directly after the prayer known as the Lord's Prayer.

"For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your father forgive your trespasses."

I accept the condition. There is an offer; I accept it. If you will forgive men that trespass against you, God will forgive your trespasses against him. I accept the terms, and I will never ask any God to treat me better than I treat my fellow-men. There is a square promise. There is a contract. If you will forgive others God will forgive you. And it does not say you must believe in the Old Testament, or be baptised, or join the church, or keep Sunday; that you must count beads, or pray, or become a nun, or a priest; that you must preach sermons or hear them, build churches or fill them. Not one word is said about eating or fasting, denying or believing. It simply says, if you forgive others God will forgive you; and it must of necessity be true. No god could afford to damn a forgiving man. Suppose God should damn to everlasting fire a man so great and good, that he, looking from the abyss of hell, would forgive God.—How would a god feel then?

Now let me make myself plain upon one subject, perfectly plain. For instance, I hate Presbyterianism, but I know hundreds of splendid Presbyterians. Understand me. I hate Methodism, and yet I know hundreds of splendid Methodists. I hate Catholicism, and like Catholics. I hate insanity but not the insane.

I do not war against men. I do not war against persons. I war against certain doctrines that I believe to be wrong. But I give to every other human being every right that I claim for myself.

The next thing that I find is in the seventh chapter and the second verse: "For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." Good! That suits me!

And in the twelfth chapter of Matthew: "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father that is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother. For the son of man shall come in the glory of his father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according——." To the church he belongs to? No. According to his creed. No. To the manner in which he was baptised. No. "Then he shall reward every man according to his works." Good! I subscribe to that doctrine.

And in the eighteenth chapter: "And Jesus called a little child to him and stood him in the midst; and said: 'Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" I do not wonder that in his day, surrounded by scribes and Pharisees, he turned lovingly to little children.

And yet, see what children the children of God have been. What an interesting dimpled darling John Calvin was. Think of that prattling babe, Jonathan Edwards! Think of the infants that founded the inquisition, that invented instruments of torture to tear human flesh They were the ones who had become little children. They were the children of faith.

So I find in the nineteenth chapter: "And behold, one came and said unto him: 'Good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?' And he said unto him. 'Why callest thou me

good? There is none good but one, that is God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' He saith unto him 'which?'"

Now there is a fair issue. Here is a child of God asking God what is necessary for him to do in order to inherit eternal life. And God said to him: Keep the commandments. And the children said to the Almighty: "Which?" Now if there ever has been an opportunity given to the Almighty to furnish a man of an inquiring mind with the necessary information upon that subject, here was that opportunity. "He said unto him, which? And Jesus said: Thou shalt do no murder; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not bear false witness; honor thy father and mother: and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

He did not say to him: "You must believe in me—that I am the only begotten son of the living God." He did not say: "You must be born again." He did not say. "You must believe the bible." He did not say: "You must remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy." He simply said: "Thou shalt do no murder. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness. Honor thy father and thy mother; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And thereupon the young man, who I think was mistaken, said unto him: "All these things have I kept from my youth up."

What right has the church to add conditions of salvation? Why should we suppose that Christ failed to tell the young man all that was necessary for him to do? Is it possible that he left out some important thing simply to mislead? Will some minister tell us why he thinks that Christ kept back the "scheme."?

Now comes an interpolation.

In the old times when the church got a little scarce of money, they always put in a passage praising poverty. So they had this young man ask: "What lack I yet?" And Jesus said unto him: If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shall have treasure in heaven."

The church has always been willing to swap off treasures in heaven for cash down. And when the next verse was written the church must have been nearly bankrupt. "And again I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." Did you ever know a wealthy disciple to unload on account of that verse?

And then comes another verse, which I believe is an interpolation: "And everyone that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life."

Christ never said it. Never. "Whosoever shall forsake father and mother."

Why, he said to this man that asked him, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life.?" Among other things he said: "Honor thy father and thy mother." And we turn over the page and he says again: "If you will desert your father and mother you shall have everlasting life." It will not do. If you will desert your wife and your little children, or your lands—the idea of putting a house and lot on equality with wife and children! Think of that! I do not accept the terms. I will never desert the one I love for the promise of any god.

It is far more important to love your wife than to love God, and I will tell you why. You cannot help him, but you can help her. You can fill her life with the perfume of perpetual joy. It is far more important that you love your children than that you love Jesus Christ. And why? If he is God you cannot help him, but you can plant a little flower of happiness in every footstep of the child, from the cradle until you die in that child's arms. Let me tell you to-day it is far more important to build a home than to erect a church. The holiest temple beneath the stars is a home that love has built. And the holiest alter in all the wide world is the fireside around which gather father and mother and the sweet babes.

There was a time when people believed the infamy commanded in this frightful passage. There was a time when they did desert fathers and mothers and wives and children. St. Augustine says to the devotee: "Fly to the desert, and though your wife put her arms around your neck, tear her hands away; she is a temptation of the devil. Though your father and mother throw their bodies athwart your threshold, step over them; and though your children persue, and with weeping eyes beseech you to return, listen not. It is the temptation of the evil one. Fly to the desert and save your soul." Think of such a soul being worth saving. While I live I propose to stand by the ones I love.

There is another condition of salvation. I find it in the twenty-fifth chapter: "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungered and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me." Good!

I tell you to-night that God will not punish with eternal thirst the man who has put the cup of cold water to the lips of his neighbor. God will not leave in the eternal nakedness of pain the man who has clothed his fellow-men.

For instance, here is a shipwreck, and here is some brave sailor who stands aside and allows a woman whom he never saw before to take his place in a boat, and he stands there, grand and serene as the wide sea, and he goes down. Do you tell me that there is any God who will push the lifeboat from the shore of eternal life, when that man wishes to step in? Do you tell me that God will be unpitying to the pitiful, that he can be unforgiving to the forgiving? I deny it; and from the aspersions of the pulpit I seek to rescue the reputation of the Deity.

Now I have read you substantially everything in Matthew on the subject of salvation. That is all there is. Not one word about believing anything. It is the gospel of deed, the gospel of charity, the gospel of self-denial; and if only that gospel had been preached, persecution never would have shed one drop of blood. Not one.

According to the testimony Matthew was well acquainted with Christ. According to the testimony he had been with him, and his companions for years, and if it was necessary to believe anything in order to get to heaven, Matthew should have told us. But he forgot it, or he did not believe it, or he never heard of it. You can take your choice.

In Matthew we find that heaven is promised, first, to the poor in spirit. Second, to the merciful. Third, to the pure in heart. Fourth,

to the peace makers. Fifth, to those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake. Sixth, to those who teach and keep the commandments. Seventh, to those who forgive men that trespass against them. Eighth, that we will be judged as we judge others. Ninth, that they who receive prophets and righteous men shall receive a prophet's reward. Tenth, to those who do the will of God. Eleventh, that every man shall be rewarded according to his works. Twelfth, to those who become as little children. Thirteenth, to those who forgive the trespasses of others. Fourteenth, to the perfect: They who sell all that they have and give to the poor. Fifteenth, to them who forsake houses, and brethren, and sisters, and father, and mother, and wife, and children, and lands for the sake of Christ's name. Sixteenth, to those who feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, shelter to the stranger, clothes to the naked, comfort to the sick, and who visit the prisoner.

Nothing else is said with regard to salvation in the gospel, according to St. Matthew. Not one word about believing the Old Testament to have been inspired; not one word about being baptized or joining a church; not one word about believing in any miracle; not even a hint that it was necesary to believe that Christ was the son of God, or that he did any wonderful or miraculous things, or that he was born of a virgin, or that his coming had been foretold by the Jewish prophets. Not one word about believing in the trinity, or in foreordination or predestination. Matthew had not understood from Christ that any such things were necessary to ensure the salvation of the soul.

According to the testimony, Matthew had been in the company of Christ, some say three years and some say one, but at least he had been with him long enough to find ont some of his ideas upon this great subject. And yet Matthew never got the impression that it was necessary to believe something in order to get to heaven. He supposed that if a man forgave others God would forgive him; he believed that God would show mercy to the merciful;that he would not allow those who fed the hungry to starve; that he would not put in the flames of hell those who had given cold water to the thirsty; that he would not cast into the eternal dungeon of his wrath those who had visited the imprisoned; and that he would not damn men who forgave others.

Matthew had it in his mind that God would treat us very much as we treat other people; and that in the next world he would treat with kindness those who had been loving and gentle in their lives. It may be the apostle was mistaken; but evidently that was his opinion.

III.

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

Let us now see what Mark thought it necessary for a man to do to save his soul. In the fourth chapter, after Jesus had given to the multitude by the sea the parable of the sower, his disciples, when they were again alone, asked him the meaning of the parable. Jesus replied:

"Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables:

"That seeing, they may see and not perceive; and hearing they

may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them."

It is a little hard to understand why he should have preached to the people that he did not intend should know his meaning. Neither is it quite clear why he objected to their being converted. This I suppose is one of the mysteries that we should simply believe without endeavoring to comprehend.

With the above exception, and one other that I will mention hereafter, Mark substantially agrees with Matthew, and says that God will be merciful to the merciful, that he will be kind to the kind, that he will pity the pitying, and love the loving. Mark upholds the religion of Matthew until we come to the fifteenth and sixteenth verses of the sixteenth chapter, and then I strike an interpolation put in by hypocrisy, put in by priests who longed to grasp with bloody hands the sceptre of universal power. Let me read it to you. It is the most infamous passage in the bible. Christ never said it. No sensible man ever said it.

"And He said unto them" (that is, unto his disciples), "go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

That passage was written so that fears would give alms to hypocrisy. Now, I propose to prove to you that this is an interpolation. How will I do it? In the first place, not one word is said about belief in Matthew. In the next place, not one word about belief in Mark until I come to that verse, and where is that said to have been spoken? According to Mark, it is a part of the last conversation of Jesus Christ (just before, according to the account, he ascended bodily before their eyes.) If there ever was any important thing happened in this world that was it. If there was any conversation that people would be apt to recollect, it would be the last conversation with a god before he rose visibly through the air and seated himself upon the throne of tho infinite. We have in this Testament five accounts of the last conversation happening between Jesus Christ and his apostles. Matthew gives it, and yet Matthew does not state that in that conversation Christ said: "Whoso believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and whoso believeth not shall be damned." And if he did say those words they were the most important that ever fell from lips. Matthew did not hear it, or did not believe it, or forgot it.

Then I turn to Luke, and he gives an account of this same last conversation, and not one word does he say upon that subject. Luke does not pretend that Christ said that whoso believeth not shall be damned. Luke certainly did not hear it. May be he forgot it. Perhaps he did not think that it was worth recording. Now it is the most important thing, if Christ said it, that he ever said.

Then I turn to John, and he gives an account of the last conversation, but not one solitary word on the subject of belief or unbelief. Not one solitary word on the subject of damnation. Not one. John might not have been listening.

Then I turn to the first chapter of the Acts, and there I find an account of the last conversation; and in that conversation there is not one word upon this subject. This is a demonstration that the passage in Mark is an interpolation. What other reason have I got? There is not one particle of sense in it. Why? No man can control his belief. You hear evidence for and against, and the integrity of the

soul stands at the scales and tells which side rises and which side falls. You can not believe as you wish. You must believe as you must. And he might as well have said: "Go into the world and preach the gospel, and whosoever has red hair shall be saved, and whosoever hath not shall be damned."

I have another reason. I am much obliged to the gentleman who interpolated these passages. I am much obliged to him that he put in some more—two more. Now hear:

"And these signs shall follow them that believe." Good!

"In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them. They shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover."

Bring on your believer! Let him cast out a devil. I do not ask for a large one. Just a little one for a cent. Let him take up serpents. "And if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them." Let me mix up a dose for the believer, and if it does not hurt him I will join a church. "Oh! but," they say, "these things only lasted through the Apostolic age." Let us see. "Go into all the world and preach the gospel, and whosoever believes and is baptized shall be saved, and these signs shall follow them that believe."

How long? I think at least until they had gone into all the world. Certainly those signs should follow until all the world had been visited. And yet if that declaration was in the mouth of Christ, he then knew that one-half of the world was unknown, and that he would be dead fourteen hundred and fifty-nine years before his disciples would know that there was another continent. And yet he said, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel," and he knew then that it would be fourteen hundred and fifty-nine years before anybody could go. Well, if it was worth while to have signs follow believers in the Old World, surely it was worth while to have signs follow believers in the New. And the very reason that signs should follow would be to convince the unbeliever, and there are as many unbelievers now as ever, and the signs are as necessary to-day as they ever were. I would like a few myself.

This frightful declaration, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned," has filled the world with agony and crime. Every letter of this page has been sword and fagot; every word has been dungeon and chain. That passage made the sword of persecution drip with innocent blood through centuries of agony and crime. That passage made the horizon of a thousand years lurid with the fagot's flames. That passage contradicts the sermon on the mount; travesties the Lord's prayer; turns the splendid religion of deed and duty into the superstition of creed and cruelty. I deny it. It is infamous! Christ never said it!

IV.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

It is sufficient to say that Luke agrees substantially with Matthew and Mark.

"Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Good!

"Judge not and ye shall not be judged; condemn not and ye shall not be condemned; forgive and and ye shall be forgiven." Good!

"Give and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over." Good! I like it.

"For with the same measure that you mete withal, it shall be measured to you again."

He agreed substantially with Mark; he agrees substantially with Matthew; and I come at last to the nineteenth chapter.

"And Zaccheus stood and said unto the Lord, 'Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation I restore him four fold.' And Jesus said unto him, 'this day is salvation come to this house.'"

That is good doctrine. He did not ask Zaccheus what he believed. He did not ask him, "Do you believe in the bible? Do you believe in the five points? Have you ever been baptized—sprinkled? Oh! immersed? "Half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him four fold." "And Christ said, this day is salvation come to this house." Good!

I read also in Luke that Christ when upon the cross forgave his murderers, and that is considered the shining gem in the crown of his mercy. He forgave his murderers. He forgave the men who drove the nails in his hands, in his feet, that plunged a spear in his side; the soldier that in the hour of death offered him in mockery the bitterness to drink. He forgave them all freely, and yet, although he would forgive them, he will in the nineteenth century, as we are told by the orthodox church, damn to eternal fire a noble man for the expression of his honest thoughts. That will not do. I find, too, in Luke an account of two thieves that were crucified at the same time. The other gospels speaks of them. One says they both railed upon him. Another says nothing about it. In Luke we are told that one railed upon him, but one of the thieves looked and pitied Christ, and Christ said to that thief:

"To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."

Why did he say that? Because the thief pitied him. God can not afford to trample beneath the feet of his infinite wrath the smallest blossom of pity that ever shed its perfume in the human heart!

Who was this thief? To what church did he belong? I do not know. The fact that he was a thief throws no light on that question. Who was he? What did he believe? I do not know. Did he believe in the Old Testament? In the miracles? I do not know. Did he believe that Christ was God? I do not know? Why then was the promise made to him that he should meet Christ in paradise? Simply because he pitied suffering innocence on the cross.

God can not afford to damn any man who is capable of pitying anybody.

V.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

And now we come to John, and that is where the trouble commences.

The other gospels teach that God will be merciful to the merciful, forgiving to the forgiving, kind to the kind, loving to the loving, just to the just, merciful to the good.

Now we come to John, and here is another doctrine. And allow me to say that John was not written until long after the others. John was mostly written by the church.

"Jesus answered and said unto him: Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God."

Why did he not tell Matthew that? Why did he not tell Luke that? Why did he not tell Mark that? They never heard of it, or forgot it, or they did not believe it.

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." "That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," and he might have added, that which is born of water is water.

"Marvel not that I said unto thee, 'ye must be born again." And then the reason is given, and I admit I did not understand it myself until I read the reason, and when you hear the reason, you will understand it as well as I do; and here it is: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth." So, I find in the book of John the idea of the Real Presence.

"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up.

"That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.

"For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.

"He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live."

"And shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

"And this is the will of him that sent me; that everyone which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

"No man can come to me, except the father, which has sent me, draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day."

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life.

"I am that bread of life.

"Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

"Then Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

"For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

"As the living Father has sent me, and I live by my father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.

"This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

"And he said, therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given him of my Father."

"Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.

"And whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die."

"He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal."

So I find in the book of John, that in order to be saved we must not only believe in Christ, but we must eat the flesh and we must drink the blood of Jesus Christ. If that gospel is true, the Catholic church is right. But it is not true. I cannot believe it, and yet for all that, it may be true. But I do not believe it. Neither do I believe there is any god in the universe who will damn a man simply for expressing his belief.

"Why," they say to me, "suppose all this should turn out to be true, and you should come to the day of judgment and find all these things to be true. What would you do then?" I would walk up like a man and say, "I was mistaken."

"And suppose God was about to pass judgment upon you, what would you say? I would say to him, "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you." Why not?

I am told that I must render good for evil. I am told that if smitten on one cheek I must turn the other. I am told that I must overcome evil with good. I am told that I must love my enemies; and will it do for this God who tells me to love my enemies to damn his? No, it will not do. It will not do.

In the book of John all these doctrines of regeneration—that it is necessary to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; that salvation depends upon belief—in this book of John all these doctrines find their warrant; nowhere else.

Read Matthew, Mark and Luke, and then read John, and you will agree with me that the three first gospels teach that if we are kind and forgiving to our fellows God will be kind and forgiving to us. In John we are told that another man can be good for us, or bad for us, and that the only way to get to heaven is to believe something that we know is not so.

All these passages about believing in Christ, drinking his blood and eating his flesh, are afterthoughts. They were written by the theologians, aud in a few years they will be considered unworthy of the lips of Christ.

VI.

THE CATHOLICS.

Now upon these gospels that I have read the churches rest; and out of these things, mistakes and interpolations, they have made their creeds. And the first church to make a creed, so far as I know, was the Catholic. It was the first church that ever had any power. That is the church that has preserved all these miracles for us. That is the church that preserved the manuscripts for us. That is the church whose word we have to take. That church is the first witness that Protestantism brought to the bar of history to prove miracles that took place eighteen hundred years ago; and while the witness is there Protestantism takes pains to say: "You cannot believe one word that witness says, *now*."

That church is the only one that keeps up a constant communication with heaven through the instrumentality of a large number of decayed saints. That church has an agent of God on earth, has a person who stands in the place of deity; and that church is infallible. That church has persecuted to the exact extent of her power—and always will. In Spain that church stands erect, and is arrogant. In the United States that church crawls; but the object in both countries is the same—and that is the destruction of intellectual liberty. That church teaches us that we can make God happy by being miserable ourselves; that a nun is holier in the sight of God than a loving mother with her child in her thrilled and thrilling arms; that a priest is better than a father; that celibacy is better than that passion of love that has made everything of beauty in this world. That church tells the girl of sixteen or eighteen years of age, with eyes like dew and light; that girl with the red of health in the white of her beautiful cheeks—tells that girl, "Put on the veil, woven of death and night, kneel upon stones, and you will please God."

I tell you that, by law, no girl should be allowed to take the veil and renounce the joys and beauties of this life.

I am opposed to allowing these spider-like priests to weave webs to catch the loving maidens of the world. There ought to be a law appointing commissioners to visit such places twice a year and release every person who expresses a desire to be released. I do not believe in keeping the penitentiaries of God. No doubt they are honest about it. That is not the question. These ignorant superstitions fill millions of lives with weariness and pain, with agony and tears.

This church, after a few centuries of thought, made a creed, and that creed is the foundation of the orthodox religion. Let me read it to you:

"Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith; which faith except every one do keep entire and inviolate, without doubt he shall everlastingly perish." Now the faith is this: "That we worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity."

Of course you understand how that is done, and there is no need of my explaining it. "Neither confounding the person nor dividing the substance." You see what a predicament that would leave the deity in if you divided the substance.

"For one is the person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; but the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one"—you know what I mean by Godhead. "In glory equal, and in majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, such is the Holy Ghost. The Father is uncreated, the Son uncreated, the Holy Ghost uncreated. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, the Holy Ghost incomprehensible." And that is the reason we know so much about the thing. "The Father is eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal, and yet there are not three eternals only one eternal, as also there are not three uncreated, nor three incomprehensibles, only one uncreated, one incomprehensible."

"In like manner, the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, the Holy Ghost almighty. Yet there are not three almighties, only one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God, and yet not three Gods; and so, likewise, the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, the Holy Ghost is Lord, yet there are not three Lords, for as we are compelled by the Christian truth to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord, so we are forbidden by the Catholic religion to say there are three Gods, or three Lords. The Father is made of no one; not created or begotten. The Son is from the Father alone, not made, not created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is from the Father and the Son, not made or begotten, but proceeding."

You know what proceeding is.

"So there is one Father, not three Fathers." Why should there be three Fathers, and only one Son? "One Son and not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, and not three Holy Ghosts; and in this Trinity there is nothing before or afterward, nothing greater or less, but the whole three persons are co-eternal with one another and co-equal, so that in all things the unity is to be worshiped in the Trinity, and the Trinity is to be worshiped in unity. Those who will be saved must thus think of the Trinity. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Now the right of this thing is this: That we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is both God and man. He is God of the substance of his Father begotten before the world was."

That was a good while before his mother lived.

"And he is man of the substance of his mother, born in this world, perfect God and perfect man, and the rational soul in human flesh, subsisting equal to the Father according to his Godhead, but less than the Father according to his manhood, who being both God and man is not two but one, one not by conversion of God into flesh, but by the taking of the manhood into God."

You see that is a great deal easier than the other way would be.

"One altogether, not by a confusion of substance but by unity of person, for as the rational soul and the flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ, who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, and and he sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, and He shall come to judge the living and the dead."

In order to be saved it is necessary to believe this. What a blessing that we do not have to understand it. And in order to compel the human intellect to get upon its knees before that infinite absurdity, thousands and millions have suffered agonies; thousands and thousands have perished in dungeons and in fire; and if all the bones of all the victims of the Catholic church could be gathered together a monument higher than all the pyramids would rise, in the presence of which the eyes even of priests would be wet with tears.

That church covered Europe with cathedrals and dungeons, and robbed men of the jewel of the soul. That church had ignorance upon its knees. That church went in partnership with the tyrants of the throne, and between those two vultures, the altar and the throne, the heart of man was devoured.

Of course I have met, and cheerfully admit that there are thousands of good Catholics; but Catholicism is contrary to human liberty. Catholicism bases salvation upon belief. Catholicism teaches man to trample his reason under foot. And for that reason it is wrong.

Thousands of volumes could not contain the crimes of the Catholic church. They could not contain even the names of her victims. With sword and fire, with rack and chain, with dungeon and whip she endeavored to convert the world. In weakness a beggar—in power a highwayman—alms, dish or dagger—tramp or tyrant.

VII.

THE EPISCOPALIANS.

The next church I wish to speak of is the Episcopalian. That was founded by Henry VIII., now in heaven. He cast off Queen Catherine and Catholicism together, and he accepted Episcopalianism and Annie Boleyn at the same time. That church, if it had a few more ceremonies, would be Catholic. If it had a few less, nothing. We have an Episcopalian church in this country, and it has all the imperfections of a poor relation. It is always boasting of its rich relative. In England the creed is made by law, the same as we pass statutes here. And when a gentleman dies in England, in order to determine whether he shall be saved or not, it is necessary for the power of heaven to read the acts of parliament. It becomes a question of law, and sometimes a man is damned on a very nice point. Lost on demurrer.

A few years ago, a gentleman by the name of Seabury, Samuel Seabury, was sent over to England to get some apostolic succession. We had not a drop in the house. It was necessary for the bishops of the English church to put their hands upon his head. They refused. There was no act of parliament justifying it. He had then to go to the Scotch bishops; and, had the Scotch bishops refused, we never would have had any apostolic succession in the New World, and God would have been driven out of half the earth, and the true church never could have been founded upon this continent. But the Scotch bishops put their hands on his head, and now we have an unbroken succession of heads and hands from St. Paul to the last bishop.

In this country the Episcopalians have done some good, and I want to thank that church. Having on an average less religion than

the others—on an average you have done more good to mankind. You preserved some of the humanities. You did not hate music, you did not absolutely despise painting, and you did not altogether abhor architecture, and you finally admitted that it was no worse to keep time with your feet than with your hands. And some went so far as to say that people could play cards and that God would overlook it, or would look the other way. For all these things accept my thanks.

When I was a boy, the other churches looked upon dancing as probably the mysterious sin against the Holy Ghost; and they used to teach that when four boys got in a hay-mow, playing seven-up, that the eternal God stood waiting to strike them down to the lowest hell. That church has done some good.

The Episcopal creed is substantially like the Catholic, containing a few additional absurdities. The Episcopalians teach that it is easier to get forgiveness for sin after you have been baptized. They seem to think that the moment you are baptized you become a member of the firm, and as such are entitled to wickedness at cost. This church is utterly unsuited to a free people. Its government is tyrannical, supercilious and absurd. Bishops talk as though they were responsible for the souls in their charge. They wear vests that button on one side. Nothing is so essential to the clergy of this denomination as a good voice. The Episcopalians have persecuted just to the extent of their power. Their treatment of the Irish has been a crime—a crime lasting for three hundred years. That church persecuted the Puritans of England and the Presbyterians of Scotland. In England the altar is the mistress of the throne, and this mistress has always looked at honest wives with scorn.

VIII.

THE METHODISTS.

About a hundred and fifty years ago, two men, John Wesley and George Whitfield, said, If everybody is going to hell, somebody ought to mention it. The Episcopal clergy said: Keep still; do not tear your gown. Wesley and Whitfield said: This frightful truth ought to be proclaimed from the housetop of every opportunity, from the highway of every occasion. They were good honest men. They believed their doctrine. And they said: If there is a hell, and a Niagara of souls pouring over an eternal precipice of ignorance, somebody ought to say something. They were right; somebody ought, if such a thing is true. Wesley was a believer in the bible. He believed in the actual presence of the Almighty. God used to do miracles for him; used to put off a rain several days to give his meeting a chance; used to cure his horses of lameness; used to cure Mr. Wesley's headaches.

And Mr. Wesley also believed in the actual existence of the devil. He believed that devils had possession of people. He talked to the devil when he was in folks, and he told him that he was going to leave; and that he was going into another person. That he would be there at a certain time; and Wesley went to that other person, and there the devil was, prompt to the minute. He regarded every conversion as warfare between God and this devil for the possession of

that human soul, and that in the warfare God had gained the victory. Honest, no doubt. Mr. Wesley did not believe in human liberty. Honest, no doubt. Was opposed to the liberty of the Colonies. Honestly so. Mr. Wesley preached a sermon entitled: "The Cause and Cure of Earthquakes," in which he took the ground that earthquakes were caused by sin; and the only way to stop them was to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. No doubt an honest man.

Wesley and Whitfield fell out on the question of predestination. Wesley insisted that God invited everybody to the feast. Whitfield said he did not invite those he knew would not come. Wesley said he did. Whitfield said: Well, he did not put plates for them, anyway. Wesley said he did. So that, when they were in hell he could show them that there was a seat left for them. The church that they founded is still active. And probably no church in the world has done so much preaching for as little money as the Methodists. Whitfield believed in slavery, and advocated the slave trade. And it was of Whitfield that Whittier made the two lines:

> He bade the slave ships speed from coast to coast,
> Fanned by the wings of the Holy Ghost.

We have lately had a meeting of Methodists, and I find by their statistics that they believe that they converted 130,000 folks in a year. That, in order to do this, they have 26,000 preachers, 226,000 Sunday-school scholars, and about $100,000,000 invested in church property. I find in looking over the history of the world, that there are 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 of people born a year, and if they are saved at the rate of 130,000 a year, about how long will it take that doctrine to save this world? Good, honest people; but they are mistaken.

In old times they were very simple. Churches used to be like barns. They used to have them divided—men on that side, and women on this. A little barbarous. We have advanced since then, and now we find as a fact, demonstrated by experience, that a man sitting by the woman he loves can thank God as heartily as though sitting between two men that he has never been introduced to.

There is another thing the Methodists should remember, and that is that the Episcopalians were the greatest enemies they ever had. And they should remember that the Free-Thinkers have always treated them kindly and well.

There is one thing about the Methodist church in the North that I like. But I find that it is not Methodism that does that. I find that the Methodist church in the South is as much opposed to liberty as the Methodist church North is is in favor of liberty. So it is not Methodism that is in favor of liberty or slavery. They differ a little in their creed from the rest. They do not believe that God does everything. They believe that he does his part, and that you must do the rest, and that getting to heaven is a partnership business. The Methodist church is adapted to new countries—its ministers are generally uncultured, and with them zeal takes the place of knowledge. They convert people with noise. In the silence that follows most of the converts backslide.

In a little while a struggle will commence between the few who are growing and the orthodox many. The few will be driven out, and the church will be governed by those who believe without understanding.

IX.

THE PRESBYTERIANS.

The next church is the Presbyterian, and in my judgment the worst of all, as far as creed is concerned. This church was founded by John Calvin, a murderer!

John Calvin, having power in Geneva, inaugurated human torture. Voltaire abolished torture in France. The man who abolished torture, if the Christian religion be true, God is now torturing in hell, and the man who inaugurated torture, is now a glorified angel in heaven. It will not do.

John Knox started this doctrine in Scotland, and there is this peculiarity about Presbyterianism—it grows best where the soil is poorest. I read the other day an account of a meeting between John Knox and John Calvin. Imagine a dialogue between a pestilence and a famine! Imagine a conversation between a block and an ax! As I read their conversation it seemed to me as though John Knox and John Calvin were made for each other; that they fitted each other like the upper and lower jaws of a wild beast. They believed happiness was a crime; they looked upon laughter as blasphemy; and they did all they could to destroy every human feeling, and to fill the mind with infinite gloom of predestination and eternal death. They taught the doctrine that God had a right to damn us because he made us. That is just the reason that he has not a right to damn us. There is some dust. Unconscious dust! What right has God to change that unconscious dust into a human being, when he knows that human being will sin; when he knows that human being will suffer eternal agony? Why not leave him in the unconscious dust? What right has an infinite God to add to the sum of human agony? Suppose I knew that I could change that piece of furniture into a living, sentient human being, and I knew that that being would suffer untold agony forever. If I did it, I would be a fiend. I would leave that being in the unconscious dust. And yet we are told that we must believe such a doctrine or we are to be eternally damned! It will not do.

In 1839 there was a division in this church, and they had a lawsuit to see which was the church of God. And they tried it by a judge and jury, and the jury decided that the new school was the church of God, and then they got a new trial, and the next jury decided that the old school was the church of God, and that settled it. That church teaches that infinite innocence was sacrificed for me! I do not want it! I do not wish to go to heaven unless I can settle by the books, and go there because I ought to go there. I have said and I say again, I do not wish to be a charity angel. I have no ambition to become a winged pauper of the skies.

The other day a young gentleman, a Presbyterian who had just been converted, came to me and he gave me a tract, and he told me he was perfectly happy. Said I, "Do you think a great many people are going to hell?" "Oh, yes." "And you are perfectly happy?" "Well, he did not know as he was, quite." Would not you be happier if they were all going to heaven?" "Oh, yes." "Well, then, you are not perfectly happy?" "No he did not think he was." "When you get to heaven, then you will be perfectly happy?" "Oh, yes." "Now, when we are only going to hell, you are not quite happy; but

when we are in hell, and you in heaven, then you will be perfectly happy? You will not be as decent when you get to be an angel as you are now, will you?" "Well," he said "that was not exactly it." Said I, "Suppose your mother were in hell, would you be happy in heaven then?" "Well," he says, "I suppose God would know the best place for mother." And I thought to myself, then, if I was a woman, I would like to have five or six boys like that.

It will not do. Heaven is where those are we love, and those who love us. And I wish to go to no world unless I can be accompanied by those who love me here. Talk about the consolations of this infamous doctrine. The consolations of a doctrine that makes a father say, "I can be happy with my daughter in hell;" that makes a mother say, "I can be happy with my generous, brave boy in hell;" that makes a boy say, "I can enjoy the glory of heaven with the woman who bore me, the woman *who would have died for me* in eternal agony." And they call that tidings of great joy.

No church has done more to fill the world with gloom than the Presbyterian. Its creed is frightful, hideous, and hellish. The Presbyterian god is the monster of monsters. He is an eternal executioner, jailer and turnkey. He will enjoy forever the shrieks of the lost,—the wails of the damned. Hell is the festival of the Presbyterian god.

X.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

I have not time to speak of the Baptists,—that Jeremy Tailor said were as much to be rooted out as anything that is the greatest pest and nuisance on the earth. He hated the Baptists because they represented, in some little degree, the liberty of thought. Nor have I time to speak of the Quakers, the best of all, and abused by all. I cannot forget that John Fox, in the year of grace, 1640, was put in the pillory and whipped from town to town, scarred, put in a dungeon, beaten, trampled upon, and what for? Simply because he preached the doctrine: "Thou shalt not resist evil with evil." "Thou shalt love thy enemies." Think of what the church must have been that day to scar the flesh of that loving man! Just think of it? I say I have not time to speak of all these sects—the vareties of Presbyterians and Campbellites. There are hundreds and hundreds of these sects, all founded upon this creed that I read, differing simply in degree.

Ah! but they say to me: You are fighting something that is dead. Nobody believes this now. The preachers do not believe what they preach in the pulpit. The people in the pews do not believe what they hear preached. And they say to me: You are fighting something that is dead. This is all a form, we do not believe a solitary creed in the world. We sign them and swear that we believe them, but we do not. And none of us do. And all the ministers, they say in private, admit that they do not believe it, not quite. I do not know whether this is so or not. I take it that they believe what they preach. I take it that when they meet and solemnly agree to a creed, they are honest and really believe in that creed. But let us see if I am waging a war against the ideas of the dead. Let us see if I am storming a cemetery.

The Evangelical Alliance, made up of all orthodox denominations of the world, met only a few years ago, and here is their creed: They believe in the divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the holy scriptures; the right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the holy scriptures; but if you interpret wrong you are damned. They believe in the unity of the godhead and the trinity of the persons therein. They believe in the utter depravity of human nature. There can be no more infamous doctrine than that. They look upon a child as a lump of depravity. I look upon it as a bud of humanity, that will, in the air and light of love and joy, blossom into rich and glorious life.

Total depravity of human nature! Here is a woman whose husband has been lost at sea; the news comes that he has been drowned by the ever-hungry waves, and she waits. There is something in her heart that tells her he is alive. And she waits. And years afterwards as she looks down toward the little gate she sees him; he has been given back by the sea, and she rushes to his arms, and covers his face with kisses and with tears. And if that infamous doctrine is true every tear is a crime, and every kiss a blasphemy. It will not do. According to that doctrine, if a man steals and repents, and takes back the property, the repentance and the taking back of the property are two other crimes. It is an infamy. What else do they believe? "The justification of a sinner by faith alone," without works—just faith. Believing something that you do not understand. Of course God can not afford to reward a man for believing anything that is reasonable. God rewards only for believing something that is unreasonable. If you believe something that is improbable and unreasonable, you are a Christian; but if you believe something that you know is not so, then,—you are a saint.

They believe in the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and in the eternal punishment of the wicked.

Tidings of great joy! They are so good that they will not associate with Universalists. They will not associate with the Unitarians; they will not associate with scientists; they will only associate with those who believe that God so loved the world that he made up his mind to damn the most of us.

The Evangelical Alliance reiterates the absurdities of the Dark Ages—repeats the five points of Calvin—replenishes the fires of hell—certifies to the mistakes and miracles of the bible—maligns the human race, and kneels to a human god who accepted the agony of the innocent as an atonement for the guilty.

XI.

WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE?

Then they say to me: "What do you propose? You have torn this down, what do you propose to give us in place of it?" I have not torn the good down. I have only endeavored to trample out the ignorant, cruel fires of hell. I do not tear away the passage: "God will be merciful to the merciful." I do not destroy the promise; "If you will forgive others, God will forgive you." I would not for anything blot out the faintest star that shines in the horizon

of human despair, nor in the sky of human hope; but I will do what I can to get that infinite shadow out of the heart of man.

"What do you propose in place of this?"

Well, in the first place, I propose good fellowship—good friends all around. No matter what we believe, shake hands and let it go. That is your opinion; this is mine: let us be friends. Science makes friends; religion, superstition, makes enemies. They say: Belief is important. I say: No, actions are important. Judge by deed, not by creed. Good fellowship—good friends—sincere men and women—mutual forbearance, born of mutual respect. We have had too many of these solemn people. Whenever I see an exceedingly solemn man, I know he is an exceedingly stupid man. No man of any humor ever founded a religion—never. Humor sees both sides. While reason is the holy light, humor carries the lantern, and the man with a keen sense of humor is preserved from the solemn stupidities of superstition. I like a man who has got good feeling for everybody; good fellowship. One man said to another:

"Will you take a glass of wine?"

"I do not drink."

"Will you smoke a cigar?"

"I do not smoke."

"Maybe you will chew something?"

"I do not chew."

"Let us eat some hay."

"I tell you I do not eat hay."

"Well, then, good-by, for you are no company for man or beast.',

I believe in the gospel of Cheerfulness, the gospel of Good Nature; the gospel of Good Health. Let us pay some attention to our bodies. Take care of our bodies, and our souls will take care of themselves. Good health! And I believe the time will come when the public thought will be so great and grand that it will be looked upon as infamous to perpetuate disease. I believe the time will come when man will not fill the future with consumption and insanity. I believe the time will come when we will study ourselves, and understand the laws of health and then we will say: We are under obligation to put the flags of health in the cheeks of our children. Even if I got to heaven, and had a harp, I would hate to look back on my children and grand-children, and see them diseased, deformed, crazed—all suffering the penalties of crimes I had committed.

I believe in the gospel of Good Living. You can not make any god happy by fasting. Let us have good food, and let us have it well cooked—and it is a thousand times better to know how to cook than it is to understand any theology in the world. I believe in the gospel of good clothes; I believe in the gospel of good houses; in the gospel of water and soap. I believe in the gospel of intelligence; in the gospel of education. The schoolhouse is my cathedral. The universe is my bible. I believe in that gospel of justice, that we must reap what we sow.

I do not believe in forgiveness as it is preached by the church. We do not need the forgiveness of God, but of each other and of ourselves. If I rob Mr. Smith and God forgives me, how does that help Mr. Smith? If I, by slander, cover some poor girl with the leprosy of some imputed crime, and she withers away like a blighted flower and afterward I get the forgiveness of God, how does that help her?

If there is another world, we have got to settle with the people we have wronged in this. No bankrupt court there. Every cent must be paid.

The Christians say, that among the ancient Jews, if you commited a crime you had to kill a sheep. Now they say "charge it." "Put it on the slate." It will not do. For every crime you commit you must answer to yourself and to the one you injure. And if you have ever clothed another with woe, as with a garment of pain, you will never be quite as happy as though you had not done that thing. No forgiveness by the gods. Eternal, inexorable, everlasting justice, so far as Nature is concerned. You must reap the result of your acts. Even when forgiven by the one you have injured, it is not as though the injury had not been done. That is what I believe in. And if it goes hard with me, I will stand it, and I will cling to my logic, and I will bear it like a man.

And I believe, too, in the gospel of Liberty, in giving to others what we claim for ourselves. I believe there is room everywhere for thought, and the more liberty you give away, the more you will have. In liberty extravagance is economy. Let us be just. Let us be generous to each other.

I believe in the gospel of Intelligence. That is the only lever capable of raising mankind. Intelligence must be the savior of this world. Humanity is the grand religion, and no God can put a man in hell in another world, who has made a little heaven in this. God cannot make a man miserable if that man has made somebody else happy. God cannot hate anybody who is capable of loving anybody. Humanity—that word embraces all there is.

So I believe in this great gospel of Humanity.

"Ah! but," they say, "it will not do. You must believe." I say No. My gospel of health will bring life. My gospel of intelligence, my gospel of good living, my gospel of good-fellowship will cover the world with happy homes. My doctrine will put carpets upon your floors, pictures upon your walls. My doctrine will put books upon your shelves, ideas in your minds. My doctrine will rid the world of the abnormal monsters born of ignorance and superstition. My doctrine will give us health, wealth and happiness. That is what I want. That is what I believe in. Give us intelligence. In a little while a man will find that he can not steal without robbing himself. He will find that he cannot murder without assassinating his own joy. He will find that every crime is a mistake. He will find that only that man carries the cross who does wrong, and that upon the man who does right the cross turns to wings that will bear him upward forever. He will find that even intelligent self-love embraces within its mighty arms all the human race.

"Oh," but they say to me, "you take away immortality." I do not. If we are immortal it is a fact in nature, and we are not indebted to priests for it, nor to bibles for it, and it cannot be destroyed by unbelief.

As long as we love we will hope to live, and when the one dies that we love we will say: "Oh, that we could meet again," and whether we do or not it will not be the work of theology. It will be a fact in nature. I would not for my life destroy one star of human hope, but I want it so that when a poor woman rocks the cradle and sings a lullaby to the dimpled darling, she will not be compelled to

believe that ninety-nine chances in a hundred she is raising kindling wood for hell.

One world at a time is my doctrine.

It is said in this Testament, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof;" and I say: Sufficient unto each world is the evil thereof.

And suppose after all that death does end all. Next to eternal joy, next to being forever with those we love and those that have loved us, next to that, is to be wrapt in the dreamless-drapery of eternal peace. Next to eternal life is eternal sleep. Upon the shadowy shore of death the sea of trouble casts no wave. Eyes that have been curtained by the everlasting dark, will never know again the burning touch of tears. Lips touched by eternal silence will never speak again the broken words of grief. Hearts of dust do not break. The dead do not weep. Within the tomb no veiled and weeping sorrow sits, and in the rayless gloom is crouched no shuddering fear.

I had rather think of those I have loved, and lost, as having returned to earth, as having become a part of the elemental wealth of the world—I would rather think of them as unconscious dust, I would rather dream of them as gurgling in the streams, floating in the clouds, bursting in the foam of light upon the shores of worlds, I would rather think of them as the lost vision of a forgotten night, than to have even the faintest fear that their naked souls have been clutched by an orthodox god. I will leave my dead where nature leaves them. Whatever flower of hope springs up in my heart I will cherish, I will give it breath of sighs and rain of tears. But I can not believe that there is any being in this universe who has created a human soul for eternal pain. I would rather that every god would destroy himself; Iwould rather that we all should go to eternal chaos, to black and starless night, than that just one soul should suffer eternal agony.

I have made up my mind that if there is a God, he will be merciful to the merciful.

Upon that rock I stand.—

That he will not torture the forgiving.—

Upon that rock I stand.—

That every man should be true to himself, and that there is no world, no star, in which honesty is a crime.

Upon that rock I stand.—

The honest man, the good woman, the happy child, have nothing to fear, either in this world or the world to come.

Upon that rock I stand.

AUG 16 1900

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 226 115 4

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 226 115 4